Darmody, E.F. Nationalism in Serbia since the French Revolution.

Thesis 1933

STORED

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LIBRARY
Thesis
Darmedy, E.F.
1933

The Gift of Eleanor Frances Darmedy

School of Education
June 15, 1933
10973
stored

Ed.
Thesis
Darmedy
1933
Stored

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

NATIONALISM IN SERBIA SINCE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Submitted by

Eleanor Frances Darmedy

(B. S. in Ed., Boston University, 1932)

In partial fulfillment of requirements for the
degree of Master of Education

1933

First Reader: Frank Nowak, Professor of History, College of Liberal Arts
Second Reader: Franklin C. Roberts, Assistant Professor of Education

Boston University
School of Education
Library

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALISM IN SERBIA SINCE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

1. What is Nationalism
   - a. Definition
   - b. Basis of Nationalism
   - c. Difference between Nationalism and Patriotism
   - d. Helpful qualities of Nationalism
   - e. Evils of Nationalism
   - f. The relation of Internationalism

II. History of Serbia previous to 1804 as a basis for the development of Nationalism
   - a. Description of Serbia
   - b. History from the arrival of the Serbians to 1169
     - 1. Political constitution
   - c. Dynasty of Stephan Nemanya 1169-1372
   - d. Struggle for political independence against the Turks
     - 1. Battle of Kassova and its significance
     - 2. Split of Serbians into three distinct groups
   - e. From the close of the 15th century to 1804
     - 1. Crushing of National life
     - 2. Black Mountain history
     - 3. Entrance of Austria and Russia
     - 4. French Revolution

III. History of Serbia since 1804, its affect upon the growth of Nationalism, and the foreign powers.
   - a. Janissaries

- b. Karageorge or Black George
- c. The Revolt of 1804
  - 1. Peasant uprising
  - 2. The unity of the revolt
  - 3. Desertion of Karageorge and its affect
- d. Animosity between the Serbs and Turks
- e. Milash Obrenovitch
  - 1. Insurrection of 1815
    - a' Its success
  - 2. Internal discord sets in
  - 3. Greek War for Independence
  - 4. Confidence in Milosh decreases
- f. Constitution of 1835
  - 1. Alarm of Russia and Austria
  - 2. Milosh abdicts
- g. Michael Obrenovitch
  - 1. Forced to flee
- h. Alexander Karageorgevitch
  - 1. Serbs in Hungary
  - 2. Alexanders two mistakes
    - a' Desertion of Hungarian Serbs
    - b' Desertion of Russia during Crimean War
  - 3. Influence of England
  - 4. Treaty of Paris
- i. Return of Milosh
  - 1. Cleverness in diplomacy

- j. Return of Michael
  - 1. Organization of internal government
  - 2. Adjustment of Relations with Parte
  - 3. Development of National Foreign Policy
  - 4. The success of his reign
- k. Milan Obrenovitch
  - 1. San Stefano
  - 2. Congress of Berlin
- l. Foreign Policy towards Serbia
- m. Milan as a tool of Austria
- n. Reign of Alexander and Draga
  - 1. Assassination
- o. Peter Karageorgevitch
  - 1. Age of happiness
  - 2. Internal improvements
  - 3. Improvement in Foreign Relationship
  - 4. Annexation of 1908
    - a' Reaction of Foreign Powers
    - b' Feeling of Serbia
  - 5. Macedonia Question
  - 6. Balkan Wars
  - 7. Austria desire Serbian War
  - 8. July 28, 1914
- p. World War
  - 1. Pact of Corfu
  - 2. Treaty of Versailles

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/nationalisminser00darm

- q. Problems of Jugoslavia today

IV. Literature

- a. From the 10th to the end of the 14th century
- b. Period of Renaissance
- c. Period of Decline
- d. Latest period of folklore, poetry and song
    - 1. Distinction between use by men and women
    - 2. Who wrote the material?
    - 3. Veek Karadgitch
    - 4. Poetry and its affect
- e. Influence of literature as a whole

V. Secret Societies

- a. Previous to 1914
- b. Since 1918

VI. Conclusion

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALISM IN SERBIA SINCE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

What is nationalism? The most significant emotional factor in public life today is nationalism. Of the current age it is the mark at once intense and universal. We may just look at the state of popular feeling in France in respect to Germany, or in Germany in respect to France; look at the zeal of the Italians for the newer greater Italy, at the enthusiasm of the Poles for a Poland resotred and unified, at the determination of a Turkey for and by the Turks. Let us just observe the outcome of the latest and greatest war in human annals: on the one hand, the smashing of the non-national empires of the Tsars, the Habsburgs and the Sultans, and on the other hand the building of the sovereign independence and national unity of Czechoslovakia, of Esthonia, of Finland, of Greece, of Latavia, of Lithuania, of Roumania, of Yugoslavia. Note the patriotic ardour of the Englishman in behalf of the British Empire, and no less nationalistic reaction against it of Irishmen, East Indians, and Egyptians, Perceive in the United States the pursuit of a policy of national isolation, the heightening tariff, the increasing restrictions of foreign immigration, the picturesque activities of citizens in masks and nightgowns, the vogue of Americanism and Americanization.

The word "nation" is tantalizingly ambiguous. It is an old word and has gathered much moss with the lapse of centuries. As derived from the Latin natio it meant birth or race and signified a tribe or social grouping bases on real or fancied community of blood and possessed presumably a unity of language[1]. Later it was used in certain medieval universities to designate a division of students for rating purposes according to their place of birth[2]. Edmund Spenser in The Faery Queen spoke of "a nation of birds";

---

[1] Hayes, Essays on Nationalism, p.2.

[2] Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 2 vols. (1895)

Ben Jonson styles physicians "a subtile nation", and Samuel Butler referred to lawyers as "too wise a nation t' expose their trade to disputation". Since the seventeenth century "nation" has been employed by jurists and publicists to describe the population of a sovereign political state, regardless of any racial or linguistic unity, and this description still enjoys public sanction. Thus not only the relatively homogeneous peoples of Denmark and Portugal are called nations, but the polyglot peoples of the Habsburg Empire until the close of the last war were collectively called the Austrian or the Austro-Hungarian nation and the bi-lingual Belgians and the tri-lingual Swiss are still called nations. In the United States a special usage obtains, for here the word is frequently applied to the whole body of the people coming down under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

It was in part to atone for the abuse of the word "nation" that the word "nationality" was coined in the early part of the nineteenth century and speedily incorporated into most European languages.[1] Thenceforth while "nation" continued chiefly to denote the citizens of a sovereign political state, "nationality" was more exactly used in reference to a group of persons speaking the same language and observing the same customs. The jurists have done their best to corrupt the new word "nationality" just as they had corrupted the old word "nation"; they have utilised "nationality" to indicate citizenship. For example, they speak of a person of British nationality though thereby they may mean any subject of King George V, a subject maybe, who, in the non-legal sense, belongs to the Boer nationality of South Africa or to the French-Canadian nationality of North America.

The basis of nationalism is not to be found in inherent mental or spiritual differences among human groups, or, for that matter, in racial

---

[1] The Principle of Nationalities, (1917), p. 43.

heredity or physical environment. Nationality is an attribute of human culture and civilization. Nationality is certainly an aspect of culture, and the causation of national groupings and national traits must be sought in the factors of the social and essentially humane sciences[1]. The distinctive marks and qualities of Russian, Greek, German, Japanese, or any other nationality are no mere appanage of race or incident of geography; they are the creation of social circumstance and cultural tradition.

Among the cultural characteristics of nationality language is and always has been pre-eminent. The rise and decline of nationalities and tribes have always been closely paralleled by the rise and decline of their respective languages, and both processes still go on forever.

Nationality has existed from the earliest times of which history and anthropology can treat. Most of the tribes describes by anthropologists and most of the peoples whom we encounter in history are nationalities. But this is not to say that a given nationality has always existed or always will.[2] Nationalities wax and wane, rise and fall, appear and disappear. Most of the contemporary nationalities of Europe may be said, in relation to the enormous span of human life on this globe, to be of recent birth; and today before our very eyes, numerous nationalities of American Indians are dying.

Sometimes people confuse patriotism with nationalism. Patriotism which now we connect with nationality has been historically more closely related to other loyalties of man. Patriotism means literally the love of one's terra patria or natal land. As such it must have been of slight significance to the member of an early nomadic tribe or nationality, who, as Professor J. H. Robinson has said, "can hardly have had any sweet and per-

---

1. Graham Wallace, Our Social Heritage, p.21
2. Hayes, Essays on Nationalism, p.21

manent associations with the tree and rock under which he was born". Patriotism did become a marked feature of ancient fixed and civilized life, but even then it was seldom a patriotism which reached throughout the length and breadth of the country where people of like speech had their homes; it was rarely a national patriotism. Usually the patriotism which existed was local. This sort of patriotism was natural enough. Everybody who is born and reared where his ancestors have lived from time immemorial is almost certain to feel a sentimental attachment to that locality.

Nationality has always existed. Patriotism has long existed, either as applied to a locality or as extended to an empire. But the fusion of patriotism with nationality and the predominance of national patriotism over all other human loyalties - which is nationalism - is modern, very modern.

The core of nationalism is group-consciousness, the love of the community great or small, to which we belong: but for the larger portion of the prehistoric and historic life of mankind such love of our unit has been an instinctive emotion, not a doctrine. Nationality is the self-consciousness of a nation, and its flowing current is fed by many streams. Though neither the occupation of a defined area, nor community of race, language, religion, government, or economic interests is indispensable to national self-consciousness, each of these factors constitutes a powerful tie and tends to produce the cohesiveness and solidarity in which the strength of a nation resides. Indeed in the absence of such connecting links it would be childish to expect a vigorous national sentiment.

"A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a nationality", wrote Mill in 1862 in this Representative Government, "if they are united among themselves by common sympathies, which do not exist between them and any

others, which make them co-operate more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be government by themselves, or a portion of themselves, exclusively. Their feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of community of race and descent. Community of language and community of religion greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is the identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past"[1]. Renan's celebrated lecture, "Qu'est-ce qu' une nation?" leads to the same conclusion, "What constitutes a nation is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future". "A nation", pronouces Gittre, the eminent philologist, "is a union of men inhabiting the same territory, whether or not subject to the same government, and possessing such common interests of long standing that they may be regarded as belonging to the same race". "A nationality" echoes Durkheim, the Belgian sociologist, with admirable brevity, "is a group of which the members, for racial or merely historic reasons, wish to live under the same laws and for a state". "Nationality, like religion", we learn from Professor Zimmern, "is subjective; psychological; a condition of mind; a spiritual possession; a way of feeling, thinking, and living."

Nationalism denotes the resolve of a group of human beings to share their fortunes, and to exercise exclusive control over their own actions. Where such a conscious determination exists there should be a state, and there will be no abiding peace until there is a state[2]. Where there is a

---

[1] What is National Spirit?" The Century Magazine, vol. XCIII, (Nov.,1916) p. 59

[2] Gooch, Nationalism, p.8.

soul there should be a body in which it may dwell. Here is the master-key to the political history of nationalism in the nineteenth century.

Whether nationalism as a process is a curse or a blessing, we have no stomach to declare. History makes us timid, humble about passing moral judgment or basing philosophic speculation on great and long-continued historic processes. Nationalism as an historic process has been great and long-continued and to regret and condemn it would be for us purely academic diversions; we couldn't undo it if we would; we certainly couldn't re-fashion all those multitudinous factors, personal and social, economic and political, religious and cultural, which during many centuries now past recall have transformed city-states and feudal states into national states. Nationalism of this sort is not a proper subject of blame or praise; it is simply a fact as little deserving of benediction or anathema as the fact that man has two legs or the fact that the earth revolves about the sun.

Whether we like it or not, some form of nationalism is likely to continue indefinitely. Present-day nationalism is a novel and recent phenomenon, but its roots reach far back into the past. Nationality has been for centuries upon centuries too constant and consistent an expression of man's gregariousness to make us optimistic about our chances of substituting for it in the twentieth century Anno Domini some other form of gregariousness[1]. It is freighted with too precious a cargo of popular feelings and desires and sentiments.

According to most contemporary students of the subject, national consciousness is not only natural and instinctive but valuable and useful, and should be fostered rather than depressed. We shouldn't wish to get rid of it even if we could. In the words of Mr. John Oakesmith, national patriotism "is not only explicable as a national sentiment, but justifiable as a reason-

---

[1] Hayes, Essays on Nationalism, p. 248.

able faith."[1] The numerous champions of nationality and national consciousness advance two major arguments in support of their position: first, that nationality possesses great spiritual value in that it is a safe-guard against materialistic cosmopolitanism, and, secondly, that nationality possesses high cultural value. The most convincing exponent of the first point is Mr. Alfred Zimmern and his argument is, "Nationality, rightly regarded, is not a political but an educational conception. It is a safeguard of self respect against the insidious onslaught of materialistic cosmopolitanism. It is the sling in the hands of weak undeveloped peoples against the Goliath of material progress. The vice of materialism is jingoism and there are always good Liberals amongst us ready to point a warning finger against its manifestations. The vice of internationalism is decadence and the complete eclipse of personality, ending in the type of character and social life which good conservatives instinctively detest, but have seldom sufficient patience to describe. No task is more urgent among backward and weaker peoples than the wise fostering of nationality and the maintenance of national tradition and corporate life as a school of character and self respect."[2]

On the cultural value of nationality a great deal has been written during the last hundred years. Much of it is overdrawn and exaggerated. But after making due allowance for era and exaggeration we must acknowledge that nationality has been throughout the ages a great conserver of human differences in architecture, in literature, in the plastic and pictorial arts, in music, in dancing, in all aesthetic manifestations of man's civilization, and also in modes of thought which enrich his being and in customs and manners which embellish his life. To the common store of the world's civili-

---

1. A.E.Zimmern, Nationality and Government, p. 53-4.
2. A.E.Zimmern, Nationality and Government, p. 53-4

zation, the several self-conscious nationalities undoubtedly have made, and still are making, significant special contributions; undoubtedly, too, the common store of the world's culture is all the larger by reason of a past and present cultural competition among the contributing nationalities.

The qualities and the nature of nationality constitute one reason why some form of nationalism is likely to continue indefinitely. Nationalism is too firmly entrenched in the primitive popular principle of nationality and in the powerful political organization of the modern national state to be dislodged immediately or routed utterly. Yet unless we look forward with equanimity to a worsened world, we shall eagerly desire some mitigation of nationalism. For in present-day nationalism there are grave abuses which, unless they are removed or remedied, will almost certainly plunge the several nationalities and the several national states into madness and ruin.[1]

That there are evils in nationalism has been recognized by many critics. Mr. Sidney Brooks thinks that war - the greatest curse of nationalism - is the result of the union of nationality and patriotism. "Patriotism or nationality," he says, "was never a more stubborn or more jealous fact than it is today ... To those who believe in and dream of and work for a coming time of universal peace, I would say, 'Nationality, there is the enemy'. Universal peace may come as the result of a worldwide despotism, through the undermining and destruction of the sentiment of nationality, or by means of a transformation in the moral values, judgments, and instincts of mankind; but in no other way."[2]

What, in summary, are these grave evils and abuses? First is the spirit of exclusiveness and narrowness which thrives on, and in turn merges, a smugness that is laughable, an ignorance that is dangerous, and an uncritical pride that can be reduced, if at all, only by a beating. Secondly,

---

[1] Hayes, Essays on Nationalism, p. 255.

[2] Harper's Monthly Magazine, Vol. CXXXIII, The Dream of Universal Peace, pp. 862-863

nationalism places a premium on uniformity. It prescribes national models of art, national standards of thought, and national norms of conduct, and to these it expects all the inhabitants of each national state to conform. Individual differences, class differences, religious differences, are alike deemed unfortunate; and the individual of genius is suspect, especially if his genius displays itself in criticism of national uniformity. Third, nationality increases the docility of the masses. As a result of their national upbringing and their lifelong nationalist education, they are seldom inclined to question the providential character of their nationality, of their state, of their government, or of the economic circumstances in which they live. In the name of national rights, national interests, and national honour, they will forego their own individual rights, sacrifice their own individual interests and even forswear their own individual honour. They are ready in the name of the liberty and freedom of their own nationality to abridge the liberty of fellow citizens and to take away the freedom of other nationalities. Fourthly, nationalism in its present form focusses popular attention upon war. War is the historic tradition of a nationality which the national state, under present conditions, does most want to keep alive and active in the minds and in the hearts of its citizens. Military heroes outrank in national pantheons the heroes of science and art and learning.

To urge the mitigation of nationalis and the propagation of internationalism is not to decry patriotism. Rather it is to purify and exalt true patriotism. For it should ever be remembered that critics of public policy, even more than blind devotees, may be inspired by the truest love of native land, by real patriotism. Patriotism is love of one's country, and, as has been suggested, love of one's country is a peculiarly natural and

ennobling expression of man's primitive sentiment of loyalty.

Nationalism is partly love of country but chiefly something else. Nationalism is a proud and boastful habit of mind about one's own nation, accompanied by a supercilious or hostile attitude toward other countries; it admits that individual citizens of one's country may do wrong, but it insists that one's nationality or national state is always right. Nationalism is artificial and it is far from ennobling; in a word it is patriotic snobbery.

True patriotism, on the other hand, involves humility. If one has real love for his country, he shall be bowed in humility in its presence and in its service, and in humble fashion we shall labor to bring to it all the blessings and hopes of humanity and to promote the happiness and well-being of all its citizens. One would not have the time or the inclination to attack other countries or other peoples. Nationalism, when it becomes synonymous with the purest patriotism will prove an unique blessing to humanity and to the world.

Now, let us look at the development of nationalism in Serbia and its results. The Serbs were the first of the Balkan people to assert their nationhood in response to Napoleon's call.[1] Their revolt preceded that of the Greeks by seventeen years, and its first successes were all attained the year that Napoleon became French Emperor. And it was this growth of national feeling which led to so many wars and finally to the Great War of 1914. It does not however necessarily follow that these nationality movements could not have been carried through without war if Europe had supported them against the Turkish Empire.[2] The motive force of each nationality movement is made up of two factors - a native force of revolt and a foreign force of sympathy and support. The result and successes of the Serbian revolt and growth of nationalism was due largely to their heroism and endurance be-

---

[1] Gibbons, Nationalism and Internationalism, p. 151
[2] Diplomatist, Nationalism and War in the Near East, p. 57.

cause they received far less external help than any of their brothers.[1]

We must first look to the past history of Serbia, its past nationalistic tendencies and the background which was the basis of the greater growth of Serbia nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

When the Serbians came into the Balkan Peninsula in the seventh century, they settled in the territories where they are found today - that is to say Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Old Serbia and Macedonia, Dalmatia, the Banat, with Slavonia. The kingdom of Serbia lies at the extreme north of the Balkan Peninsula. Although possessing no high mountains, Serbia is a mountainous country. The four mountain systems of the Balkan Peninsula, the Dinaric Alps, the Carpathians, the Balkans, and the Rhodopes meet and intermingle in Serbia; thus the Serbian mountains are varied both in their formation and in their structure. Except for the Save and the Danube and for a certain distance the Drina, Serbia does not possess navigable rivers. The general character of the country is of considerable beauty, and this is true, on the whole, of all Serbian countries. Thus the Serbians love their country, not only because it is the fatherland in which they live, and which they have watered with their blood, but with special affection because of its natural beauties. As a Serbian saying runs, "One travels the world over to return to Serbia". Serbia lies in the same latitude as Italy, the South of France, and Spain, though it does not possess a Mediterranean climate, but a temperate Continental one. The winds in Serbia are neither exceptionally strong nor cold. The climate has naturally a great influence upon the vegetation, which is very rich, being the same as that of central Europe.

According to the census of 1900, the population of Serbia was 2,492,882, while in 1905 it increased to 2,700,000. Of the men over 36% marry before

---

1. Seton-Watson, D. Litt., Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, p.1

they attain the age of twenty and over 57% of the women. The birth rate is 43.96 per 1000 and more than 43% of the families in Serbia possess over six members. The mass of the population lives on vegetable food, with the addition of milk and cheese, with only occasional meat. The food of the population is entirely produced in the country, and the cost of living in the interior is very low.

The Serbian language belongs to the group of Southern Slav languages which also includes Croatian, Bulgarian, and Slavonian. The Croatian language is very closely related to the Serbian, and as a matter of fact the two languages are not more different than two dialects of the same language.

Let us divide the history previous to the Serbian revolution of 1804 into four periods. First period: from the arrival of the Serbians in the Balkan Peninsula until 1169. Second period: the dynasty of Stephan Nemanya (1169-1372). Third period: the struggle for political independence against the Turks. Fourth period: from the close of the fifteenth century to the Serbian Revolution of 1804.

Of the political constitution of the Serbs in early times we know very little. The nation was composed of a certain number of tribes composed of clans more or less related to each other; each tribe formed a geographical and political unit, zupa, at the head of which was a zupan, whose title and power seem to have corresponded to that of a count among northern peoples.[1] This tribal organization is perhaps common to all the Slavonic groups and was preserved for many centuries after their Christianization. The zupans met in an assembly called Skupshtina and elected one of ther number as Grand Zupan, but as the zupas were originally quite independent of each other this title, during the early centuries of Serbian history, carried with it very

---

[1] W.M. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 42

limited authority; in fact for five centuries after the settlement of Serbia the history of the country is that of a struggle between the Grand Zupans' attempts at centralization and resistance of the zupas to these attempts. Their lack of cohesion made the Serbs an easy prey to the attacks of the Byzantines, the Bulgars, and the Franks, and under the first Grand Zupans whose history has handed down to us, Voislav and Radaslav they began slowly to realize that only by concentration of their power could they offer resistance as a nation, and a serious effort was made to found a state on the banks of the Marova, with Horea Margi as its capital. This attempt however proved abortive owing to the hostility of the Bulgars. Afresh attempt to form an independent state was made by the Zupan Vlastimir (890); this province was called Rashka. To secure its freedom from molestation, the Serbs determined to acknowledge the supremacy of Constantinople, on the express condition that they should never be subject to a government proceeding from that capital. The Emperor agreed that the Serbs should be ruled by their own zupans and should preserve their patriarchal form of government. In the very beginning of its civil life the new state of Rashka was taken under Bulgarian rule which lasted seven years (924-931). However, Bulgarian rule was so harsh that nearly the entire population fled to Croatia and to the Greek provinces.[1] Tchaslav, Zupan of a tribe gained support of the Bulgarian Tsar Simeon and was raised to the throne but spent most of his time in Bulgaria. After Simeon's death (927) when Tchaslav came to Rascia, he found the land deserted. With the help of the Byzantine Empire, whose vassal he acknowledged himself to be, prosperity was restored to the land. In spite of its unfavorable commencement, his reign was successful, uniting Danubian and Adriatic Serbia. The death of Tchaslav, however, was followed by a long period of

---

[1] Stead (compiler), Serbia by the Serbians, p.6

disorder.[1] The Greek Empire no longer having anything to fear from the enfeebled Bulgars, took possession of Rascia whose Prince fled into the maritime Serbia. From this time onward the Serbian principalities of the Adriatic slope endeavored in their turn to create a political centre. The Prince of Zeta freed himself from the Empire in 1040. Under the reign of his son Constantin Bodin (1080-1101) the Servia of Tchaslav was reintegrated. Zeta's chief defect as a political centre was its distance from the Serbian ethnographical centre. Rascia, however, did not renounce its political control.

In 1168 Rascia was divided amoung four brothers, Stephan, the youngest, aroused the jealousy of his three brothers by his solicitude for the organization of his own territory and war broke out in which he was victorious. Nemanya's vanquished brothers went to beg the Emperor's assistance. He sent them back to Rascia with an army, but they were again defeated (1169). Stephan Nemanya was, no doubt, the most prominent personage in Serbian history up to date.[2] With Nemanya begins a new page in the history of Serbia. For the time being the struggle for existance is at an end, Serbia's power and influence increases continually until at the end of the Middle Ages the empire of her Tsars ranks as one of the foremost in Europe. Stephan Nemanya began his reign by organizing the kingdom and the army with a view to future expansion. He then tried his strength against the hosts of Emperor Manuel Comnenus; but twice beaten, he consented to live on friendly terms with him and to pay tribute. In return Manuel returned to Serbia many provinces. On the death of Manuel in 1180, the Byzantine Empire being already in a state of dissolution, Stephan annexed more land and refused to pay tribute. He also strengthened the Orthodox religion in his state by building numerous churches and monasteries. Feeling the weakness of advancing age, the afed Nemanya abdicated in 1196 in favor of his able second son Stephan and withdrew to the

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 44
2. Gambier, Serbia, p. 9

to the convent of Hilendar on Mount Athos and there according to Serbian stories he continues to watch over his people.

The reign of Stephan II was one of peace and prosperity although disturbed by one ominous incident, this being a conflict between Serbia and Hungary. After Stephan's death he was succeeded by his son Radaslav (1223-1233) who was dethroned by his brother Vladislav (1233-1242) who was removed from the throne by his third brother Urash the Great (1242-1276). Urash married Helena, a French princess; this lady contributed greatly to the spread of Western culture and knowledge among her adopted people. She founded schools, churches, public libraries, built new fortresses even, and earned a debt of gratitude which the historian Guailo has duly acknowledged. After Urosh a few unimportant sovereigns followed until 1331. Next Dushan, the Powerful, the most notable of all Serbian sovereigns.[1] Under the reign of Stephan Dushan (1331-1355) the Serbian state of the Middle Ages was at the summit of its power. All the Serbian provinces except Bosnia, Ragusa, and a few territories under Hungarian rule, constituted a single state. His successes were many, and in 1345 he proclaimed himself Tsar of the Serbians and Greeks.[2] Stephan Dushan was ambitious to make of his empire a well-organized state, and with this object convoked, in 1349, an assembly of the grand barons and high clergy of Uskub. Here was promulaged the famous Zakonik (code) of the Emperor Dushan, which was completed in 1354 by the codification of the customs, ordinances, and laws of the Emperor's predecessors. Stephan dies suddenly in 1355. The death of Stephan Dushan marks the commencement of Serbian decadence. His successor Urosh was not qualified for his taks and the Servian Empire did not long survive its founder. The separatist tendencies of its government and of its various populations, the struggle between the Serbian church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Turkish invasion

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 61
2. Mijatovitch, Serbia of the Serbians, p. 3

were the chief causes of the Empire's dislocation. But the Nemanya dynasty had done a great deal. The policy of the kings of the Memanya dynasty was to profit by the disorganization of the Greek Empire, to conquer from the Greeks all the provinces inhabited by the Servians, to form a strong kingdom of Serbian, and to bring the same into prosperous commercial relations with Venice and Italy in general.[1] They introduced into the country the Saxon miners and made Serbia by their help one of the most important silver producing countries of Europe during the Middle Ages. They entered into political relations with the Holy Roman Empire and once or twice made treaties of alliance with France and with Venice.

We have reached the culminating point in the history of Serbia: her rise in power and prosperity, in spite of constant strife on the part of her rulers and would-be rulers, dates from the breaking of the power of the Byzantine emperors at the dawn of the thirteenth century; by the middle of the fourteenth a new foe had appeared in the south-east, a power more hostile, more dangerous than Byzance, a blighting influence which was to plunge the whole of the Balkans into political impotence and renewed barbarity for nearly four centuries. The Seljuk driven by the Mongols from central Asia into Armenia, had gradually moved westward through Asia Minor, established their capital at Brusa, and taken Nicea. Brave, disciplined, and well-organized as a cavalry force, and possessing in their janissaries a permanent body of infantry equal to any in the world, they constituted for Byzance and the Balkans a danger against which in the helpless state of the Empire, the only protection was the intervening sea. The emperors seemed not to realize their impending fate: already the Sultan Orkhan had obtained in marriage a daughter of Cantacuzene, and the latter was engaged with Palaeologus in unseemly strife for the throne, when in 1355 Orkhan's son Solyman crossed the Dardanelles and

---

1. Mijatovitch, Serbia of the Serbians, p.3

established himself in Gallipoli, thus obtaining for the first time a strong foothold in Europe.

Dushan at this moment had already made up his mind that the only way to secure the Balkans from invasion was to install himself in Constantinople, and by uniting the Serbian, Bulgarian, and Greek nations into one state, to regenerate and re-establish the falling empire. With a great army of 80,000 Serbs he had marched southward and easily had possessed himself of Thrace and Adrianople. Already the van of his army was almost within sight of Constantinople when on December 18th 1355, he was taken suddenly ill in the village of Diavoli and died the same night. Poison was so common a weapon in the hands of the last Byzantine Emperors that John Palaeologus may well have been responsible for Dushan's mysterious end. So, at any rate, passed away the only man who might have stayed the Ottoman onslaught, and with his disappearance all hopes of organized resistance were at an end. Although Serbia was not to succumb entirely to the Turks until a hundred years later, the process of disintegration began almost on the morrow of Dushan's death.

Tsar Sajar the next brilliant sovereign of the Serbs spent his reign in fighting cleverly first against the Hungarians, who attacked him wantonly and were heavily defeated in 1374, and then against the Turks, whose system of occupying conquered countries whith military colonies and carrying off the original inhabitants was now arousing fierce opposition. At the famous battle of Plotchnik a body of Ottoman troops was annihilated among the mountains of Montenegro.[1] Tsar Sajar then began to work to organize a coalition of the Bulgarians, Roumanians, Bosnians, and Hungarians with the Serbians against the Turks.[2] But before the Slavic people had a chance to unite after devoting a year to war preparation, the Sultan, in 1389 gathered together an exceptionally large army and entered Bulgaria to prevent a junction of Bulgarians

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 61
2. Mijatovitch, Serbia of the Serbians, p.5

and Serbians.[3] Sajar obtained the support of large bodies of Albanians and Hungarians. The Sultan Murad I entered Serbia in 1389 and a decisive battle took blace on the plain of Kossova on the 15th of June (or 28th new style) 1389.[4] This battle was fought between the whole Turkish army under Murad I and the Serbian army under Tsar Sajar. At the beginning of the day it looked as if it might be a Serbian victory and in Paris a Te Deum was sung to celebrate the Christian triumph. But soon the resistance of the Serbians was broken by the Turks, Sajar himself was taken prisoner, and the Serbian army was swept from the field. While the battle raged at its height, a Serbian nobleman, afterward a hero in the ballads, called Milosh Obilich, found means of approaching the Sultan and slew him. After the battle, by the orders of the new young sultan Bayazid, Tsar Sajar and the princes and nobles captured with him were beheaded.

The battle of Kossaova, more than any other event in Serbian history, has graven itself upon the minds of the people as an overwhelming national disaster, and throughout all Serb lands that anniversary, June 15th old style, is kept as a memorial day for mourning, not only for nation's overthrow, but for the heroes who fell on that day, and for all Serbians who have since then died in the defense of their country in all other battles from that time to the present.

The Serbs did not at first realize the significance of the Serbian loss at Kossova. The contemporary chroniclers refer to it as they do to any other battle. Only after some two decades, when it became more and more apparent that the Serbian countries were being steadily and surely closed in upon by the Turks, in spite of their utmost resistance, did the full meaning of Kossova dawn fully on the Serbian mind. From that period begins to date the great epic cycle of songs called always, up to the time of their second edi-

[3] Sajarovitch Hrebedianovitch, Serbian People, Stead,vol.II, p.511
[4] Serbia by the Serbians, p.12

tion in the nineteenth century, "The Songs of Tsar Sajar" or Sajaritza", in which Sajar Hrebeligovitch is the central figure. This epic cycle is entitled in the present editions, "Songs of the Battle of Kossova".

Sajar had reasserted central authority in the Sate, and taken up the great Serbian State's policy as it had been conceived by Nemanya and developed by his successors Kings Milutin and Deshan and finally by the Emperor Dushan by whom it had been fully formulated and elaborated. Sajar liked Dushan looked toward the East and the Aegean. The defeat of Kossova and the death of Sajar wrecked and dashed to the earth all that the Memanyas and the Serbian people had built up during the centuries, and annihilated Serbian unity and all constructive Serbian policy. From the day of Kossova Serbia ceased virtually to be an independent kingdom. For another number of years she was nominally to retain her rulers, with her centre of gravity shifting northward, the capital being moved first to Krushevate, and later to Smederevo, but the true instinct of the people led them to mourn over the "fatal field of Kossova" as that on which their independence received its death blow.[1]

During part of the fifteenth century Serbia struggled to retain some shadow of freedom, while her rulers appealed for help to Austria, Hungary, and Venice. The Ottoman power, although held in check for some time by John Hunyadi, continued slowly but surely to penetrate and crush the whole of the Balkans, Constantinople, beseiged for the third time, fell in 1453 after a heroic defense; six years later, in 1459, Mahomet II formally annexed Serbia which until the nineteenth century was reduced to a mere Turkish pashalik. Two hundred thousand of the inhabitants are said to have been led away into slavery and a number of the most influential families were rooted out. Politically Serbia ceased to exist for three hundred years. This was the end of

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p.63

the Serbian people's efforts to defend from the Turks the fragments of the medieval Serbian state. The struggle continued, but took on another character. This brings us to our survey of the fourth period, "Serbia from the close of the fifteenth century to the Serbian revolution in 1804". There began now an era of internecine fights between the various Serbian principalities, fanned and fed by outside influences and by all who saw an interest in Serbian ruin. Hungarians, Venetians, Turks -- all of whom took sides and intervend even with troops to keep the fight raging. With the oncoming Turks steadily overwhelming them, it was as if the Turks' lands had suddenly been struck by a wave of madness.

As for the people, they split into three distinct groups. Those who dwelt in the plains and lowlands of the valley of the Danube remained in their homes, and bent under the Turkish yoke; considerable numbers, and especially the inhabitants of "Old Serbia" settled in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Hungary, where large bodies of Serbians had already taken root - as late as 1694, 36,000 families crossed the Danube and colonized the Banat and the so-called military frontier; a thrid group, unwilling to yield to any authority, withdrew into the least accessible recesses of the mountains, and became practically outlaws; entrenched in their mountain passes, expert in guerilla warfare, soon inured to persecution and hardship, these indomitable fighters are known as the Haiduks and Uskaks, who preserved and upheld the traditions of heroism of their ancesteros and the spirit of their race. So tenaciously did they maintain their nationality, religion, and speech that at the dawn of the nineteenth century they still formed a nucleus round which Serbia was once more to grow into a political body.

From 1463 to 1804 the national life of the Serbs lay utterly crushed. The rayah, the enslaved Christian peasant, was exploited by heavy taxation,

cowed by restrictions, and above all by the horrible child-tribute to which the renowned corps of the Janissaries so long owed its recruits. The relations between the conqueror and the conquered are best characterized by the single fact that a Christian who failed to dismount from his horse on meeting a Turk was liable to be killed on the spot.[1] That is why the Serbians could not lightly accept Turkish domination. They were taken by the thousands and sold as slaves in the markets of Constantinople and Egypt. The Serbians that remained under Turkish yoke were by no means docile. Numerous bands of Haiduks infested the roads; they wreaked vengeance not only on Osmanli invaders, but on the renegades, who were particularly plentiful in Bosnia. The Bosnian nobility, by turns Catholic and Bogumil, had had no scruples in embracing Israel to preserve its fiefs and its privileges. The exploits of the Haiduks and the Uskaks subject of the Serbian national songs. Two things alone kept alive the Serbian tradition - the splendid popular ballads, unsurpassed in Europe for directness and imagination, and the stubborn spirit of the Orthodox clergy, who, amid ignorance, neglect, and oppression, remained the repositories of the nation's conscience. Only at two points did the flame of liberty continue to burn - in the tiny mountain section of Montenegro and in the maritime republic of Ragusa.

The Serbian Church then had the character of a national rather than a religious institution. There became the long drawn out struggle between the "Holy Cross" and the Crescent.[2]

This history of the Black Mountain is in many respects the most romantic in all the chequered annals of the peninsula. Its barren rocks and precipices became a rallying place for the Serb survivors from the fatal carnage of Kossova; and under Ivo Cruojevic, renowned in many an ancient ballad as Ivo the Black or Ivo the Big, this remnant of a warlike nation defended itself despe-

---

[1] Seton-Watson, D. Litt., The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans
[2] Stead - Serbia of the Serbians, p. 14

rately against all comers. Ivo's descendants proved unworthy of him, and the little country was reduced during the seventeenth century to pay occasional tribute to the sultan and even to provide fighting men for the Turkish service. But the spirit of the mountaineers was never wholly broken, and on Christmas Eve, 1702, at the instance of their Vladika, or Bishop, rose and massacred every Turk within their reach.

With the exception of the Turks and the Venetians, Europe had hitherto been ignorant of the very existance of Montenegro. But the exploits of Danilo found an echo in distant Russia. When the war broke out in 1710 between Russia and Turkey, A Herzegovina Serb in the Russian service proposed to Peter the Great that an attempt should be made to raise Montenegro and Herzegovina against the Turks. Another Serb soldier of fortune in Russia was accordingly sent to Danilo with a proclamation of Peter couched in terms denouncing the alliance between the barbarous Turks and the heretic king of Sweden against Russia and proclaiming the tense concern of the Tsar for the "slav" nation and his determination "to liberate the oppressed Orthodox Christians from the yoke of the infidel".[1] The proclamation produced a deep impression upon the Montenegrins, and this was but the first of many occasions on which the influence of Petrograd goaded them into action against the Turks. It became the tradition among the Vladikas to visit Russia, and so implicit and unreasoning was the faith of the mountaineers in their distant kinsmen that in 1768 an impostor, known to history as Stephan theLittle, was able for a time to usurp the Government of the Black Mountain by posing as the murdered Tsar of Russia, Peter III. The same year the renewed outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Turkey induced Catherine II in her turn to prepare a manifesto "to all Christian communities in the Greek and Slav Orthodox Nation, our

---

1. Milakovic, Storia del Mantenego, p.88

co-religionists of the Holy Eastern Church", inviting their aid if they wished to shake off the oppressive yoke of the infidels. Subsequent events, however, showed that Russian policy as yet regarded these peoples as convenient powers in a game of which Constantinople and Santa Sophia were to be the reward.

Very different was the development of Montenegro's war neighbor, the republic of Ragusa. It sank exhausted under the rule of the Habsburgs to await in fitful slumber the hour of national resurrection.

Montenegro and Ragusa were but faint and isolated beacons amid the deep gloom of the Turkish era. Meanwhile, the great mass of the Serbian race, to whom Russia was still unknown, naturally turned with eyes of hope toward the North. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the world, as far as the ignorant Serb peasant was concerned, fell into two halves, the land of the Sultan of Turkey or the land of the Caesar of Vienna.

Every time either Austria or Russia rose against the Turks, they had a feeling of hope, and when at times the actions of Austria and Russia were in union, their hope became magnified.

Now let us turn to the period following the French Revolution. Since we have reviewed the past history of Serbia we can easily see that this little group of slavic people have had little chance to develop any nationalistic feeling. First they receive an inspiration to spur them on, and then when they begin to anticipate freedom and happiness they get a push backwards and disappointments pour on them. About 1800 they watched the French Revolution with much hope and anticipation - it seemed to wake in them a new, fresh feeling of faith in their cause. This great social upheaval had an effect on many countries, but to the Serbians it seemed to serve as a symbol. In the past the people had looked to the Austrians or Russians to loosen their ties, but now

there developed a feeling of self-reliance. Now they looked to their own people, and they didn't search in vain, because about this time there came to light peasant leaders of real genius.

At the beginning of the ninetteenth century, the people had seemed almost resigned to their fate; they had lost touch with Western Europe, knew comparatively little of Russia, and were experiencing some alleviation of their misery from the kind and just rule of the Government of Belgrade, Hadji Mustapha Pasha, who kept the Spahis in order, punished any acts of violence toward the poor or helpless, and lives in Serbian tradition with the expressive title of "Mother of the Serbs". To this happy regime there was a sudden and unexpected end.

It had been arranged in the last treaty of peace between Austria and Turkey, that the Janissaries should not occupy the Serbian fortresses on the Austrian frontier; and the Bekir Pasha had actually fulfilled this stipulation, compelling the Janissaries to retire into Bosnia and Bulgaria. These troops, however, accustomed to living dissolutely at the expense of the population, insubordinated, and, through their huge numbers, already recognized as a national danger, presently rose against the sultan, who, to pacify them, permitted their return to the Pashalik of Belgrade, in violation of his treaty obligations.

The Janissaries hurried back into Serbia, promptly murdered Mustapha Pasha, organized a centralized military government of terror, and initiated a rule of such unexampled tyranny and plunder, that large numbers of the people fled to the mountains to join the Haiduks, while the Spahis, or Turkish landlords, joined the remainder of the population in their complaints to the sultan. Early in 1804 the Janissaries commissioned murderers through-

out Serbia to kill all the nobles, mayors, chiefs of cantons, priests and monks - in short, every man who possessed any influence over the people. But news of the massacre travelled fast, and every man of any standing in Lower Serbia hastened to take refuge amid the mountains and forests.

Here there was safety, but for any one who fled there could be no peaceful return to the fertile valleys below. It lay with thos who had now fled from their homes to decide their own fate and also the fate of Serbia: they must either become "outlaws" and submit to the extinction of their nation, or begin anew against their oppressors the struggle which in the past had so often ended in disaster. The outlook was black enough: war funds, artillery and equipment, supporters amoung the neighboring states leaders, all these essentials were equally lacking; they were an unorganized crowd, with their stout hearts as their only asset; yet they saw no course open to them but to fight, and to die, if die they must, bravely and as free men.

There lived at this time, in the village of Tapola, on the border of Shumadia, a man named George Petrovitch. He was better known by his Turkish name of Kara or "Black George", from his dark raven locks.[1] The son of a peasant, he had taken part in the abortive rising of 1787, and was forced to flee for his life with his old father and his belongings. When they came to the river Saye the father refused to go on, and his son, rather than allow him to be seized and tortured to death by the Turks, drew his pistol and shot him dead on the spot. In the former days he had served with the Austrian army, and had had some experience of disciplined warfare.[2] He had also been a Haiduk before the mild rule of Mustapha tempted him to the more peaceful life of a farmer. He is described as being morose and silent, impatient of control, subject to blind fits of passion, of which he repented at leisure, lacking in the coherence which education and training give. His military

---

1. Miller, The Balkans, p. 311
2. Waring, Serbia, p.87

genius was of high order, and to it much of the extraordinary success of Serbian arms in the years that followed may be attributed. About the middle of February, 1804, when the leaders of the bands of panic-stricken villagers met at the village of Orashats, in the center of Serbia, and decided to fight the Janissaries, they chose Kara George as their commander-in-chief.[1]

The story of the Serbian revolt is an epic, with folk songs for its history and Kara George for its hero.

The deeds of the Serbians and of their leader are so remarkable that even legends can hardly exaggerate them. A handful of rayahs arise suddenly, routs great Turkish armies, beseiges citadels, alternately defends and defeats pashas, and finally wins its independence by its own bravery. There is no case in which a single small power in the Balkans has done so much without more aid from the Great Powers. What Greece owed to Canning, Roumania to Louis Napoleon and Bulgaria to Tsar Alexander, the tiny states of Serbia and Montenegro owed to themselves. The one maintained, and the other achieved her liberty in the face of the whole Turkish Empire. History usually supplies the key to political miracles, and it is history alone that explains the differences between Serbia and the other Balkan states. If the Serbians achieved their freedom before the others, it was because they were more fitted to do so. The independence which they had long maintained for their church, which theystill preserved in their local government, and the untamed spirit of liberty engendered by the Haiduks of their borders, these were the sources of their strength. Other reasons there were, such as their distance from Constantinople, their inaccessible hills and forests; the money, the arms, and the literature which came from their brethren over the Danube; the decay and division of the Turks at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which

---

1. Miljatovitch, Servia of the Servians, p.9

offered an ideal moment at which to strike for freedom. Last of all there were a hundred fierce chieftains in the Serbian land, full of wild hatred of Janissaries, and thousands of Serbian peasants ready to follow them to death. Thenoblest aspect of the Serbian revolt is its universality. There was no hanging back and no treachery, yet there was no pay for those who fought, and every man who joined the ranks joined for love. It was a true peasant uprising, a people in arms for liberty and nationalism.[1] Perhaps the liberty these men sought led them to cruelty in war and to lawlessness in peace, but this wild freedom was something for which all of them were ready to die. Among wild races a great man always had immeasurable influence, yet the true hero of the revolution is not Kara George, but the individual Serbian peasant, For Kara George is only the greatest, because the most typical, of these fierce sons of freedom.

It has often been remarked that revolution occurs not among the peoples that are most oppressed, but among those which are most conscious of their oppression. So it was with the Serbians, who enjoyed privileges under the Turks such as Bulgaria and Macedonia never had. Historic memories of past greatness and consciousness of present strength enabled them to resent and to punish injiries which the Bulgars had to suffer in silence. The very mildness of the Turkish official rule inflamed the Serbians to madness against the tyrant Janissaries, who showed equal contempt for the pasha, the spahi, and the rayah.

So the peasants turned to Kara George and Kara George answered them in a way that brought even greater enthusiasm. Kara George said, "I come from that heroic people who preferred bitter death to comfortalbe and shameful slavery. My grandfather (Kara George) was a peasant, and I am prouder of that than of my throne. Crowns are lost, but the pure clean blood of those

---

[1] Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 175

who have lived of the earth does not die."[1] Kara George had the simplicity of the true peasant, and his thrifty avarice. At the height of his fame he wore his peasant's dress and plain black cap, whilst his followers glittered in silk and gold trappings. He hoarded his gold with thriftiness and treasured it with greed. He labored with his own hands in the fields, and his early adventures do not seem to have given him a distaste for a peaceful trading in pigs. Diebitsch, who saw him in 1810-11, and whose military talents entitled him to judge, said of him: "His countenance shows a greatness of mind which is not to be mistaken - he has a mind of a masculine and commanding order. The imputation of cruelty and blood-thirstiness appears to be unjust. When the country was without the shadow of a constitution he was compelled to be severe. He dared not vacillate or relax his discipline. As a soldier there is but one opinion of his talents, bravery and enduring firmness". It was indeed as a warrior that his peculiar gifts led him to excel. Gigantic instature, with long black hair and deep set glittering eyes, he was the very type of a barbaric chief. His cheek had been scarred, his right hand disabled by wounds, yet he fought with his left hand and preferred to fight in the foremost ranks on foot. His individual presence on the battle field had an indescribable effect in invigorating his own men and in disturbing the Turks. His efforts as a strategist are even more striking than his personal exertions in battle. The manner in which he controlled the divided and scattered commandos, the boldness with which he held back one Turkish army with a handful of men, whilst he concentrated his forces to defeat another, the speed and energy with which he brought up reinforcements at the critical moment, were all achievements of a high order. He had as much difficulty with all his scattered units as Prince Charlie with his Highland clans, yet he achieved a more permanent success with an authority which was personal and not

[1] Rande, Serbia, English Translation, p. 129

hereditary.[1] The real source of his power lay indeed in the strength of his character and in his imaginative insight into the minds of his fellow-peasants. He know when to terrify, when to exhort, when to strike. Some of his cruelties were probably calculated, as when he executed two of his followers for plundering and exposed their limbs on the gates of Belgrade. Others were involuntary, as when he fired at a chieftain for abandoning his position or slew his own father. Yet, whether designed or unconscious, his gestures, his actions, and his whole existance combined to impress and awe his contemporaries. For his was one of those wild, elemental natures, so often found among the savage peasants of the Balkans, cruel yet heroic, wild and yet generous He was like one of their great limestone crags, forbidding, savage and sublime.

All the peasants had resolved to die fighting in battle rather than to await death in their homes. The tale of Kara George's reluctance to accept the position of Supreme Chief is well known, probably true, and certainly characteristic.[2] At first he refused the office altogether, then he told his followers that if he accepted his rule would be stern. "If one of you were t taken in the smallest treachery, the least faltering, I would kill him, hang him, punish him in the most fearful manner". His hearers said they deserved to die for such crimes, swore to go through fire and water for him, and held up their hands to prove it. "Do you want that?" asked he thrice; and thrice came the reply, "We do." Then thundered Black George, "I too want you." He was then consecrated for his task by a priest in the presence of several chiefs and some five hundred followers. The real reason for the choice of Kara George lay partly in his own extraordinary character, of which I have already spoken, partly in the fact that he represented three aspects of Serbian life.

---

[1] Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 182
[2] Herbelianovitch, The Serbian People, p. 629-30

The knejes of village and nahai wished to revolt, but being civilians, feared the wild Haiduks from the mountains, whose aid they wished to have, As a pig dealer, Kara George understood civilians, and could conciliate them; as an old brigand he appealed to Haiduks and could keep them in check. Finally he had what the Haiduks had not, experience of the regular operations of war. It was especially important that Kara George was in command of the Shumadya, for that district was not only central, but fertile and wealthy. Kara George at first called himself only Commandant Serbiae, and was more than once reminded that his authority stopped at the Kolubara. But his supremacy was formed not only by his own superiority of character but also by circumstances. He controlled more wealth, provided more arms, and possessed more cannon than any other revolutionary leader. Finally his signal victories gained for him the title of Supreme Leader.

The Serbian revolt had the characteristic of unity in aim and diversity in method. Chiefs of Haiduks, village knejes, and warlike priests pursued their own local objects, yet at each moment critical for the national interest they were compelled to sink their differences by the arrival of Kara George. The chiefs were very numerous; they called themselves Voivodes, and were each of them surrounded by a body of devoted followers, numbering fifty to a hundred men, who rode horses and acted as cavalry. Of these Voivodes the most famous in the Shumadya were Kara George himself and Katitsch. The three districts rose almost simultaneously, and drove the Janissaries behind their fortress walls. The Bosnian Pasha sent troops to relieve them, but these were stopped on the frontier, and the Turks learned that with astonishment the Serbs were well-armed and understood the art of taking cover. The news was true, and it came as an unwelcome surprise. It was not the last

time that the enemy was to learn of the natural military gifts of the Serbian The Serbian peasant was one of the hardiest of men, enduring, seasoned to all weathers, patient and fearless.[1] The leaders of the Haiduks excelled in the skirmish, the old volunteer corps were equal to more regular operations, and the momkes were good light horses. The chieftains made much use of entrenchments for defence and for siege work. Finally, Kara Geogre managed to use his position as commander-in-chief in such a way as to co-operate with his numerous and irregular lieutenants.

There is no evidence that the Servians began the revolt with an idea of ultimate independence.[2] The Serbians decided to apply to a great power for support. There can be no doubt that Austria was seriously considered and it is possible that approaches were made. Kara George himself always had regard for Austria. But the power of Russia had greatly increased, and she had recently gained a great influence in Moldavia and Wallachia. It was finally decided to send a mission to Russia, which returned in February, 1805, with a promise of Russian support to any petitions laid before the Sultan. A deputation set off to Constantinople to present the Serbian case. The Sultan repudiated the Serbian claims, arrested their deputies, and ordered the whole country to submit. Open hostilities broke out.

In 1805 the Serbs did well but in 1806 Kara George earned undying fame. In the middle of 1807 some Russian troops arrived and supported the Serbians Good fellowship was the result and it was increased by Russian aid lent to Montenegro. Moreover, Nappleon made an agreement with the Russians in 1807, and the French abandoned their support of the Turks. Selim managed to repulse a British naval attack on Constantinople in 1807, but was himself deposed in the same year. All was chaos at Constantinople in 1808.

---

1. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 185
2. Seton-Watson, D.Litt. Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, p.179

The Serbian successes had been too great to be permanent. No army can continue to defeat forces three or four times its own size, when the enemy is approximately equal in bravery and equipment. The amazing triumphs had been due not only to the skill of the leaders and to the bravery of the men, but also to the Turkish contempt for the rayah, to the anarchy at Constantinople, and to the independence of the pashas. This blow to Musulman pride, the intervention of Russia, the danger to the very existence of the Ottomans, had thoroughly aroused both pashas and Sultan.

The year 1809 was likewise very memorable to the Jugo-slavaians, owing to Napoleon's victory over Austria at Wagram.

The year 1810 opened darkly for Kara George. He was blamed for the defeat before Nish, and sorely harassed by the opposition party. During the next years the fighting was desultory and Khurshid Pasha amused himself and deluded the Serbians with an honorable offer of peace. Kara George refused to make peace without the Russians; his loyalty to Russian met with little reward. Threatened by Napoleon's invasion, the Russians hastily made peace with the Turks in 1812.

In 1813 Serbia received a blow to her nationalistic program. Kara George her hero suddenly lost heart and fell back on Belgrade, leaving on the frontier his comrades without warning or explanation. In October he fled over the Danube into Hungary with a few followers, leaving his countrymen to their fate. It was a sad end to a great career. The conduct of Kara George at this crisis is one of the numerous unsolved mysteries in his own life and in modern Serbian history. Some have insinuated that it was his desire to secure his buried gold and transport it unscathed to Hungary. So singular an explanation is not impossible for one who combined the coarseness of

a peasant with the ability of a soldier and a chief. Yet perhaps a simpler cause was this, despair of a gloomy, imaginative nature, the decay of a strong will broken and agonized by suffering. This failure of nerve, this almost womanly terror was shown by Frederick once, by Napoleon twice, at important crises of their careers. Such collapse is perhaps not astonishing in a man of action rendered desparate by overwhelming responsibility or by disaster.

Thus the stab of the Serbians at liberty and freedom shows us that the feeling for nationalism is becoming more intense and has spread a great deal during this insurrection. The desertion of Kara George left a deep impression on the Serbian people; he had been their hero, their idol, they had feared him but loved him; now all this was smashed, should they excuse him or condemn him? The opinion was more or less divided and the feeling of unity which had given so much force to this insurrection was lost. But all was not lost, because there came to light in Serbia when all seemed so dark, a certain Milosh Obrenovitch, a man whose influence and leadership brings new light to Serbia and her nationalism.

Milos Obrenovitch was the one now to carry on the liberation of Serbia. He was unquestionably one of the most remarkable leaders of his age.[1] Amidst the general panic he had remained cool enough to gauge the situation and grasp the possibilities which it offered both to the country and to his own ambitions.[2] Milosh Obrenovitch, instead of abandoning his country, had gathered his partisans around him and taken refuge in Shumadia. Cunning, unscrupulous, unfathomable, yet a patriot better fitted than Kara George to play against the Turks their own game of duplicity and bribery. Most of the leaders, including Jacob Nemadovitch, followed Kara George into exile into Hungary, Milosh with calm courage decided to await events in his own home.

---

1. Seton-Watson D.Litt., The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, p. 201
2. Petrovitch, History of Serbia, p.91

"What will my life profit me in Austria", said he in reply to the entreaties of Jacob Nemadovitch, "while in the meantime the enemy will seal into slavery my wife and child and my aged mother? No, the fate of my fellow countrymen, whatever it shall be, shall be mine also."[1]

The Turks, on re-entering Serbia toward the beginning of October 1813 found the towns and villages deserted. The population had taken refuge in the mountains. The Grad Vizier Kaurshid Pasha forbade his troops to molest the Serbs and invited the inhabitants to return to their homes. In order to hasten the pacification of the country the Turkish Grand Vizier treated with Milosh Obrenovitch, offering to recognize him as head of the Serb nation,and chief administrator of Rudvik Nabia. Milosh Obrenovitch decided to accept the Turkish offer and undertook to aid in the pacification of the country.

When the Serba had once more returned to their villages the Grand Vizier returned to Constantinople, leaving as Pasha of Belgrade Sulieman Pasha Scopliac, who hitherto had been one of the commanders of the Bosnian Turkish troops warring against the Serbians. The Pasha confirmed Milosh as Oborknez of the Nabias of Rudvik, Pojhega, and Kragomjevatz, comprising the whole mountainous district in central Serbia - the Shumadia.[2]

However, friendship between the Turk and the Serb was not possible. Not only the Turkish "Spahis" of Turkish feudal landowners, but also all the Turks who had formerly lived in Serbia returned to their prey and made claims not only to alleged property, but to compensation for what they claimed to have lost during the insurrection; also many Turks sought out their enemies of former days and wrought "justice" on them. These conditions filled the land with violence and murder. The great numbers of Turkish troops overrunning the country and garrisoned in all the towns and fortified places lived on the land exactly as they had before the first insurrection. Exces-

---

1. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 196
2. Herbelianovitch, Serbian People, vol.II, p.663

sive taxes were collected from the people in claim of arrears. The inhabitants were striped of every possession great and small, being bereft finally of bare food, so that in 1814 a famine spread over the land. Starving and goaded by unbearable provacation, the Serbians began to prepare as best they could to arise in insurrection. Such were the conditions when in October 1814 a quarrel between some Turks and Hadji-Prodan, a Serb of Smitza, at the Monastery of Truava, was the match that lit the fire of a new conflagration. Soon the Nabias of Kragomjevatz and Pojhega were thoroughly aroused. Hadji-Prodan called on Milosh Obrenovitch to head the insurrection but Milosh saw that the right time had not come for the rising and advised Prodan to be patient and not encourage demonstrations that would provoke Turkish reprisals, Milosh then made to the Turkish Pasha an offer to himself pacify the population. When the Turkish troops were directed against the disorders ,Milosh, with some Serbians of his own, joined the Turkish expedition, hoping by that means to protect the people against the excesses of the Ottoman soldiery. In violation of Sulieman Pasha's promise of free pardon to all the rebels except to their leader Prodan, the Turkish Second-in-Command arrested about one hundred and fifty of the more important Serbians and brought them in chains to Belgrade. There on November 23, 1814, they were executed. Thirty-six, with the abbot of the Monastery of Truava, were nailed to the wheel. The Turks expected by those acts to terrorize the population and entirely crush the Serbian spirit.

As the rising of Hadji-Prodan had proved that the Serbs were still in possession arms, orders were given for a complete disarmament of the Serb people. The search for arms in the houses of the Serbs was accompanied by the most fearful acts of violence and indescribable tortures on the part

of the Turks. Many of the Serb notables were assassinated. The situation became serious even in the eyes of the Turks, and Sulieman Pasha called to Belgrade all the leaders and chiefs of the people and warned them in a speech against any further attempt to rise, ordering them to return to their districts to collect the taxes for which they were asked, and to bring them to Belgrade themselves. Milosh Obrenovitch was among these thus enjoined, but the Pasha kept him back at Belgrade instead of allowing him to return home with the others.

The chief men of the Serbians who had come at the call of the Pasha to Belgrade siezed the occasion to resolve themselves into a secret National Assembly at Rudovitza where they decided to rise up in a new insurrection and once more to call upon Milosh to lead them.

Meanwhile Milosh, who was under strict surveillance at Belgrade tried to find a way of escape. Fortunately the way presented itself in the cupidity of Ipshia Pasha, who had during the disarmament accumulated an enormous mass of loot as well as a number of prisoners. Milosh offered to ransom the prisoners and to pay a sum of money to buy back the least valuable part of the loot. The bargain was sealed, Milosh declaring that he could only obtain the funds by going home to collect them personally and fetch them to Belgrade. At the request of Ipshir,Sulieman gave leave to Milosh to return for that purpose to his home at Tzrnutje in the Nabia of Rudvik. Even before the beginning of Holy Week there was hand-to-hand fighting between the inhabitants of Rudvik and the Turks. One of the Serb headmen was assassinated by some Turks and in the passion of the moment the entire population rose and cleared the enemy out of the village and the whole Nabia.

On Palm Sunday, 1815, after a sacred service in the church of Takava,

where the people were assembled in the expectation of reaching a decision in regard to a new rising, Milosh come to them. They felt if he would not lead them nothing would be done. They would only quarrel and the Turks would get the best of them. Milosh did not say much; he told them that it would be a heavy undertaking and that he feared they would break down. But when they answered him in one voice,"We know that we are ready for anything! Dost thou not see that we perish as it is?" Then Milosh spoke again and said, "Here am I, there stand you, so be it! War to the Turks! With us is God and His Right."

Close by the Church was the oak of Takava which Serbians hold dear; under its shade was the stone on which Milosh stood. On the same day he sent out proclamations to the entire Serb people of the Pashalik of Belgrade callint them to arms, and ordered that bands should be formed in every village and district and the Turks attacked wherever found.

On all sides, from hiding-places in rocky caves and underground caverns came forth arms, and wherever attack from the Turkish forces was to be expected, fortifications and trenches appeared. The Serbs rallied to the cause of "Nationalism". In the past year when they had had to struggle even for existence this spirit and feeling for their nation had not been crushed, just held out of sight, and now they allowed it to bloom forth with a new color, even brighter than in the past.

When the news of this rising reached Belgrade, Ipshir Pasha, the second in command of the Pashalik started with a force then thousand strong to concentrate at Tchatchak, on the Western Morava, with the intention of quelling the Serbian rising by a series of expeditions, using that place as a centre. But Milosh was too quick and clever to let this go by and after several combats we find the Turks in flight and Milosh in victory. The news of that success

spread rapidly through the country and also across the Danube into Austria Many of the former leaders in the first insurrection under Kara George who were in Symria and the Banat, hearing again the sound of Serbian guns, hastened to follow the call, and returning to their native districts, roused the people and helped to raise and organize anew a Serbian army.

At the news of the defeat by Milosh, the Turkish troops of Kragomjevatz and other places deserted their quarters, and the entire Shumadia district, the centre of modern Serbia, found itself again freed from the Turks. Following this, Milosh obtained many more victories and finally the Turks were driven out of all Serbian territory. The prisoners of war were conducted across the river Drina into Turkish Bosnian territory and set free.

Milosh shared at this time the general confidence of the Serbs in the resistless power and sympathetic good will of"Orthodox Russia". It was at this time, after the fall of Napoleon, that the European powers met at the Congress of Vienna. Milosh sent there the arch priest Matte Memadovics, to beg the Tsar to help Serbia. A letter of Milosh to Nemadovi~~cs~~tch is extant, in which he simply and impressively represents the unhappy condition of Serbia, and indirectly reproaches Russia for having sacrificed her. He writes to Nemadovics, "Do not excuse yourself by the plea that you have no money for the journey. If you have no money, go on foot and beg by the road. Suffer hunger and misery as we are doing here, but go to Vienna. Go and see the glorious Russian Tsar, who, we are told, has helped so many strange nations, and see and let us know if he has really and entirely given us up".[1]

Nemadovics went to Vienna, and there remained some five or six months; going from the Representative of one great Power to another begging for help. But his endeavours were all in vain. The Emperor of Austria received him,

---

1. Mijatovics, History of Modern Serbia, p. 80

indeed, and promised to make such representations in Constantinople as should stop the revengeful policy of the Turks in Serbia; but he refused any other aid. The Tsar would not even receive him, although he went day after day to one or another Russian diplomatist, begging that they would help him to an audience.

At last Count Bulgakoff declared to Memadovics, in the name of his government, that Russia was in such circumstances at present that any help she would give to Serbia would rather injure her than otherwise. Upon this Nemadovics observed that Serbia was afraid of offending Russia if she took any steps without her. "No," replied Bulgakoff, "you will not offend her; the circumstances are such that you must work alone and for yourselves."

This simple answer, though it produced at first a mingled feeling of consternation and indignation in Serbia, had, nevertheless, salutary effects. Milosh and his co-patriots knew that they could not reckon on any foreign succor, and began to count up more diligently their own and their countries' resources. Milosh looked to her own, was convinced, and won for Serbia her liberation from Turkish insults and beatings. By a provisional arrangement, Serbia recovered her autonomy, subject to the payment of a tribute and to the continued occupation of Belgrade by a Turkish garrison; at the same time Milosh was acknowledged as the actual chief of the Serbian nation.[1]

Peace was no sooner secured, however, than that bane of Serbia, party strife and iternal discord, immediately recommenced. The archbishop of Belgrade and the voyvode Peter Mater headed a movement against Milosh which cost them their lives. No sooner had they been executed than another tragic event occurred: Kara George, who had been living in Russia for the last four years, reappeared in Serbia in July 1817, on the invitation of a group of Haiduks

---

[1] Petrovitch, Serbia, p.94

who wished to restore him to power, and took up his abode with the mayor of Samendria. Kara George's idea on his return to Serbia was to ally the Serbians with the disaffected Greeks and make a joint attack on the Sultan. Milosh judged this policy dangerous and opposed it, and seems to have been justified by events.[1] Milosh sent a courier to Kara George, directing him to leave the country at once, and wrote in threatening terms to the mayor. A few days later the head of Kara George was brought to Milosh and laid at his feet. He had been, it would appear, murdered in his sleep; but by whom and at whose instigation, has remained a mystery, and one of the most controverted questions in Serbian history. The guilt has been commonly fastened on Milosh, and the murder was undoubtedly one of a succession of similar deeds which have been directly due to the deadly animosity between the Kara George and Obrenovitch houses, yet it has been argued that some one had overstepped his instructions, as Milosh, with his impulsive and calculating nature, could not but have but have realized the odium which he would incur through so foul an action. It remains though that the death of Kara George was followed on November 6th by the proclamation of Milosh, in an assembly of all the knezes and bishops, as Prince of Serbia.

The next few years brought new hope to the nation. In six month Milosh Obrenovitch had driven the Turks from Serbia; it took thrice that number of years to establish her independence on a firm foundation. In the diplomatic game he had few equals.[2] Astute and patient, restrained and tenacious, he was well fitted to wear down the obstinate resistance of Mahmud II. The trump card which Milosh had was the fear that Porte had of Russia. But he perfectly understood that the army of Russia could not easily come to the aid of Serbia. Consequently his policy was to keep Serbia clear of all entangl-

---

1. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 207
2. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 203

ing connections with discontented Christians subjects of Turkey in Greece or Roumania. If Serbia remained free of such intrigues, he calculated that the numerous ambiguities of her position would be cleared up, and Turkish suspicions would be averted. One day the Sultan would be found in a good mood, or the Grand Vizier would be frightened, or Pashas bribed, and then concessions would be made. With Milosh being so careful and not compromising his country in the Greek War for independence, he wrung from the Turks, in return for his neutrality, a number of valuable concessions: the treaties of Akkerman (1826) and Adrianople (1829) definitely regularized the position of Serbia; the Porte solemnly acknowledged Russia's right to protect that country, which was granted religious liberty and internal autonomy, the right to choose her own prince, to dispense justice, and to raise the taxes for the tribute. By wholesale bribery Milosh obtained in Constantinople in 1830 a formal recognition as hereditary Prince of Serbia, much to the displeasure of Russia; the Hattisherifs of June 6th and December 4th, 1834, settled the yet outstanding differences with the Porte; six of the districts that had been torn from Serbia were restored; the amount of the tribute was fixed; and Turkish occupation was restricted to Belgrade.

During the years of Milosh's administration the consolidation of internal order and the development of internal resources proceeded. The increasing exportation of cattle and swine made a rapid improvement in the economic condition of the country. The customs levied on the Austrian frontier, which Milosh bought from the Turks, produced a continually increasing revenue. The priests were given a regular income, and a theological seminary was established, as well as a number of normal schools for the training of teachers. The civil legislation was recast on the basis of the Code Napoleon and the system

of taxation simplified.

Supported by his armed partisans, Milosh unfortunately exercised his authority in a manner which before 1830 had already assumed the character of arbitrary despotism. He took possession at his own price of whatever he found desirable: land, houses, or mills, and burnt down one of the suburbs of Belgrade to rebuild it according to his own fancy.

While the Prince's ambitious designs for the independence of his country awakened alarm and distress in Russia, his arbitrary rule and his haughty attitude toward the leaders called forth bitter opposition from within. Agitation succeeded agitation; the chiefs who had accompanied Kara George into exile had now returned to Serbia and were either conspiring against Milosh or calling aloud for a constitution. His friends deserted him - even his wife, to whose wise counsels he owed so much, finally deserted him, for his sensuality and debauchery had overpassed all bounds.[1] All of the people were disappointed and were beginning to worry. This wasn't the thing they had fought and struggled for for so long. Now that they had risen above the abuse of the Turks and had established their nationality on a new height, they didn't want it curshed and belittled by an ambitious leader, selfish and interested in his own advance. All the people called aloud for a constitution. At last, an elaborate plot which was discovered in 1834 made Milosh realize the gravity of the situation; he promised to convoke the Skupshtina and to grant reforms.

A constitution was elaborated on a French model. The national assembly was to meet every year and have the right to initiate new legislation; legislative power, however, would be vested in the Prince and in a Senate; personal liberty and security of property were guaranteed, and serfdom was to be

---

[1] Gavebier, F. W. Serbia, p.58

abolished, This elaborate scheme was accepted by the Skupshtina in February 1835, although it contained many inconsequences and was fundamentally unsuited to the simple and patriarchal life of the Serbians.

The Constitution of 1835 alarmed both Austria and Russia. Serbia might strive for and win much freedom as long as it didn't affect their monarchical views, but once it did, a halt would be necessary. The former, under Metternich, protested against its being put into operation, but the policy of Russia was different and more subtle. The mystery which is supposed to accompany Slavonic character is certainly present in her diplomacy. The Russians disapproved, but the Tsar advised Serbia to go on with her policy. That was one of Tsar Alexander's peculiarities, preaching democracy in foreign capitals at the moment when he was practising despotism in his own.

The new Constitution was issued in a Turkish decree of the 24th of December, 1838.[1] It was so distasteful to Milosh that he wished to suppress it, and would probably have done so had the opposition not been wise and acted with great promptitude. The National Court of Chancery, which had never forgotten its claims to executive power, practically usurped the nominating power granted to the Prince, and appointed both Senate and Ministry.

Milosh was in no condition to resist, and at first retired across the Danube to Semliu in fear of his life, announcing that he would not return until his chief opponents were removed from the Senate. Though the followers of Milosh began to arm in the mountains, the general feeling was decisively against him. Vutchnitch, who had suppressed the rebellion of 1825 in the name of Milosh now suppressed the rebellion of Milosh in the name of thè Senate. June 13th, Milosh abdicated for his oldest son, Milan, an invalid who died without being conscious of his elevation. Michael, the second son of the old Prince, was next chosen by the Senate.

---

[1] Rauke, History of Serbia, p.203

Michael, being only seventeen years of age, was assisted by regents. Many men in Serbia were bitterly opposed to the Obrenovitch house, and actually invited the son of Karageorge to return to Serbia in order to ingratiate himself with the people and to prepare them for a change of dynasty. Finally Michael was forced to cross over to Austria confessing that his attempt to rule had been a failure. On September 14, an assembly of people, convoked in Belgrade and strongly influenced by the able and astute Eliya Garashaiu, who was soon to become one of the foremost statesmen in Serbia, unanimously elected as Prince the son of Karageorge, Alexander Karageorgevitch. This son of the great Karageorge was born in the year 1806, in the period of his father's greatest triumph when nationalism and hope had been booming. Unfortunately, Prince Alexander, though well-intentioned and moral, was weak and unfitted to guide the ship of Serbia through the stormy waters she was to encounter. The Porte stood firmly by Karageorgevitch and showed signs of strengthening its influence and authority. Czar Nicholas of Russia felt that he should have been consulted before any such step was taken. Czar Nicholas now became the champion of Serbian freedom and insisted on a free election. He personally favored the Obrenovitch line, but the sublime Porte countered this move by insisting on the exclusion of Michael as young and inexperienced. Hence there were only two candidates: Alexander Karageorgevitch and old Milosh.

In 1848, Prince Alexander was faced with a problem of first-class importance--the question of the attitude and policy of Serbia toward the Serbs of Hungary. These Trans-Danubian Serbs had exercised a most important influence on the culture and education of Serbia. Neither Karageorge, Milosh, nor Vutchutch could write, and the schools and the language of Serbia were

founded and moulded by Serbs from over the water. They had aided the Serbs with money, arms, and blood in the revolt against the Turks; now they called for the same support against the Magyars.[1]

During the eighteenth century the Serbs had been subjected by the Hungarian government to oppression, on account of their religious and civil independence. Speaking generally, they had maintained their religious independence, but had lost all political rights. But during the twenty years previous to 1848 they were subjected to a new pressure, that of forcible nationalization--that is, of Magyarization. The policy of the Magyar government had been purely religious in its oppression in the eighteenth century, and had persecuted Serbs who refused to become Catholics. Now it assumed a more dangerous form, and persecuted Serbs who refused to become Magyars. The policy was national and Chauvinistic in the highest degree; official pressure was applied to destroy the Serb language and to stamp out the Serb nationality in Hungary. But shortly, a Serb who declared himself a Magyar was well-treated; a Serb who refused to do so was not. Then in the year 1848 came the great uprising, when revolution and freedom were everywhere and every king in Europe trembled on his throne. Headed by Kossuth, the Magyars hastened to extort a pledge of complete self-government from the Austrian Emperor. Liberation and political rights were in everyone's mouth. It was natural that the Hungarian Serbs should think that the Magyars who spoke so loudly of liberty would be willing to grant some concessions to them. A deputation of Hungarian Serbs waited on Kossuth in April, 1848 and held an interview which has become famous.

They demanded the recognition of their language in public documents and of their rights as a nation. "What," said Kossuth, "do you understand by

---

1. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 229

'nation'?" "A race," said the head of the deputation, "which possesses its own language, customs, and culture, and self-consciousness enough to preserve them." "A nation," said Kossuth, "must have its own government." "We do not go so far," said the head of the deputation, "One nation can live under several different governments, and again several nations can form a single state!" The discussion outlined clearly the two views--the Magyar unable to conceive a nation unless as a unified government, the Serb conceiving a nation as a linguistic unity. The views were irreconcilable, and Kossuth, recognizing the fact, dismissed the deputation with the famous words, "In that case, the sword will decide!"[1] It did, though not in the way anticipated either by Magyar or by Serb. The situation was critical, for in the autumn of 1848 the Magyar government of Hungary broke out into open revolt against Austria. The Slavs of Hungary generally sided with the Austrian government against the Magyars. The opponent most formidable to the Magyars was Jellanchutch, Governor or Ban of Croatia, a popular colonel, who contrived to arouse the Croats and at the same time managed to ingratiate himself with the Austrian government. Jellachutch advanced into Southern Hungary, calling on all Slavs to revolt against the Magyars. He was joined by many Slavs of South Hungary, who were already in revolt and had sent urgent messages to their Serbian brethren to join them. Prince Alexander was placed in a serious difficulty. The great Serbo-Croat coalition, the Jugoslav nation, had at last formulated its demands. Slavonia and South Hungary were to be formed into a Voivodate, and like Croatia were to have home rule. The Serbians of Serbia were subject to the Turks and influenced by Russia. A decisive intervention by the Serbians might lead to a definite union of all three branches of the Serbo-Croat race under the Austrian Em-

---

[1] Seton-Watson, Southern Slav Question, p. 47

peror. The Austrian yoke would perhaps be light, and in any case offered the only opportunity of uniting the three long-severed peoples. It was a moment of crisis when a man of genius in Serbia might have changed the current of Austrian history and altered the map of the Balkans.

Had Milosh still been Prince, it is reasonably certain that he would have thrown in his lot with the Serbs of South Hungary. But Prince Alexander was not a man for heroic decisions, and the weakness of his character was not supported by any particular strength in his position. Consequently he was bound to listen to the remonstrances of the Sultan and the Czar. The latter was preparing to invade Hungary from the north and was certain of subduing the Magyar revolt. Russia was not therefore anxious for Serbia to be embroiled, as any entanglement might lead to her annexation by Austria. The Serbian Skuptchina was summoned and, apparently under Russian pressure, voted against any overt acts of hostility to the Magyars. Alexander could not prevent, and did not desire to prevent, supplies, arms, ammunition, and volunteers being sent to the Serbs of South Hungary. Milosh and Michael Obrenovitch, from their exile in Wallachia, warmly supported the revolt and still further discredited the unhappy Alexander. The fact that Austrian and Russian Emperors both loaded him with decorations on account of his neutrality did not increase his popularity. Many Serbians thought that he should have risked all recklessly and generously to free thosebrethren over the river who had done so much to free Serbia in bygone days. In the end neither Croats nor Serbs gained by their support of Austria against the Magyars. The Austrian Emperor took the title of Grand Serbian Voivode, but ultimately handed the Serbs and Croats back to their Magyar masters. In the settlement of 1867-1868 the Croats gained a species of self-government and

the Serbs certain rights of language and nationality. But neither in one case or the other has the real concession ever corresponded to the legal one. The extraordinary tenacity of the Croats has enabled them to maintain a semi-independent condition, but the Serbs have steadily lost ground to Hungary. Some of them have been forcibly Magyarized, and the rest have slowly dwindled in numbers, and seemed up to the World War in 1914 to be losing their vitality and self-sufficiency. There were still some six hundred thousand Serbs in South Hungary, but they are no longer of the same importance as in the early nineteenth century, when they gave volunteers, priests, ministers, bishops, money, arms, brains, and inspiration to the Serbians. The result of the events of 1848 was to exalt the importance of the Serbians south of the Danube and Save at the expense of their brethren on the north.

Whether or not Alexander deserted the Serbs in 1848, he certainly did not support Russia in 1854, during the Crimean War. Though ministry and people sympathized with Russia, Prince Alexander confessed himself excessively pressed and intolerably importuned by her attentions. Foublanque, the British consul at Belgrade, informed him that, "in following the distinct line of his duty the Prince of Serbia had nothing to fear, as the Greatest Power in the World had resolved on maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire." He suggested possible advantages to Serbia from commercial intercourse with England and made "suggestions for the aggrandisement of Serbia" by diplomatic concessions from Turkey. These were the inducements to prevent the Russian offers from having too much weight. Finally Alexander informed Foublanque that he wished to remain neutral, but would declare for Russia if forced to do so.[1] As it turned out force dictated another decision. An Austrian army was concentrated opposite Belgrade, and a Turkish

---

[1] F. O. 1008. Turkey, Record Office. Foublanque to Stratford de Redcliffe, Dec. 31, 1853, Jan. 9, 11, 16, 31, Feb. 8, March 5, 10; Foublanque to Clarendon, Jan. 26, 1854.

force approached Serbia from the South. The Sultan demanded a pledge of armed neutrality, but offered once more to guarantee the internal autonomy of Serbia. This was negotiating with a gun in one hand and sugar in the other, and it was well to choose the peaceful solution. When Austrian forces moved into Roumania and cut off all hope of Russian cooperation, neutrality became not simply the best, but the only policy. In the end it produced useful results for Serbia in the Treaty of Paris, which ended the war in 1856. This agreement gave Serbia a guarantee of some independence but still preserved the Sultan's superiority. A more important result was a permanent estrangement between Russia and Austria, and that fact was not to the disadvantage of the Serbs. It was still more in her favor that she could appeal in the future to France and England in case of Turkish encroachments. But the peasants of Serbia had not any profound insight into the mysteries of high policy; they saw only the humiliation of their Prince before the Great Powers, and his evident subservience to Austria, which had betrayed the Serbs of Hungary. The unpopularity of Prince Alexander grew rapidly, and the project of restoring the Obrenovitches was seriously discussed.

At this time Sir Henry Bulwer (Lord Dalling) was English Ambassador at Constantinople, and he visited Belgrade in the autumn of 1858. It is said that he advised some of the Serbian leaders to elect a regular Assembly and settle their differences in a properly constitutional manner. This advice was quite in the style of the Palmerstonian diplomats of that date, though Palmerston had favored the absolution of Milosh in days gone by, and Foublanque had recently encouraged Alexander in the same course. But it is not certain that this advice was ever given, or at least the advice may not have been responsible for the desired result.[1] In any case, affairs had reached

---

[1] Miller, Ottoman Empire, p. 250

such a deadlock that some such step was inevitable. The popular opinion was that the Prince was the tool of Turkey and Austria, and that the senators were self-seekers and intriguers. The former must be deposed, and the latter restrained by a Skuptchina. The latter body had not met for ten years, but it was not a dead body, nor ever will be until democracy is dead in the heart of a Serbian. The Skuptchina dated back to the days of Karageorge. It had even been occasionally summoned by Milosh for important decisions and crises. It corresponded roughly to the Primitive Assembly of armed warriors, which ratifies or forbids a barbaric king's decision to go to war by a thunder of cheers or of hisses. But its meetings had become irregular under Milosh. Its representation had never been fixed. Any Serbian was theoretically free to attend it, but in practice it had generally been filled with supporters of the reigning prince. It was always a tumultuous body, usually incapable of debate and acquiescent in proposals offered. The novelty about the Skuptchina that now met was that it consisted of five hundred representatives, duly elected by taxpayers. It was a regularly constituted body, not a mere meeting packed with armed warriors. The demand for a Skuptchina to settle existing difficulties was now supported by some of the senators and by so overwhelming a popular wish that it was impossible to resist it. The Skuptchina was fairly representative, and showed itself hostile both to Prince and Senate. After passing a motion to the effect that it should be annually summoned in future, the Skuptchina denounced the foreign policy of the Prince and called for his resignation.[1] Alexander refused and fled to the Turkish fortress in Belgrade for refuge. The senators exulted at his fall; but they exulted too soon. The day after the flight of Alexander, the Skuptchina demanded the recall of the "Old Lord"

---

1. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 237

Milosh Obrenovich. For a moment there was a chance that the Senate would unite with Prince Alexander and appeal to the army. But the people were behind the Skuptchina and every Serbian in these days was a potential soldier as well as a possible revolutionist. The foreign Representatives used their best efforts to avert bloodshed and violence. Prince Alexander refused to avail himself of the support of the army, and the Skuptchina solemnly deposed him, appointing a provisional Government under Milosh. The Czar, who was furious with Alexander over the Crimean War, was delighted at his fall, and England and Russia found themselves both supporting the democratic movement. France immediately recognized Milosh, and Austria most reluctantly followed suit. There remained only Turkey, and Turkey was pleased because the wily Milosh refused to accept the princely office without the consent of the Sultan. The Porte accepted him, but refused to affirm that the princely office was to be hereditary in the Obrenovitch line. On January 3, 1859, Alexander legally abdicated. He laid down, perhaps with no sorrow, a burden already too heavy for him. The amiable character of the Prince should not obscure his weakness as a prince. The Serbian peasant even in those days was primarily a democrat, but he was capable of forgetting his democratic instincts in the sight of a man. There are three requisites for being a Balkan ruler: the first is personality, the second is personality, and the third is personality. Alexander possessed none, and Milosh all of these things. At the beginning of 1859 Milosh once more returned to Serbia as Prince, after an absence of twenty years. He was received with a welcome and a gaiety which are still remembered in Serbia, and his popularity was only increased by the fact that Austria had refused to allow one of her steamers to ferry him across the Danube. "My only care,"

Boston University
School of Education
Library

said he to the people, "will be to make you happy, you and your children, whom I love as well as my only son, the heir to your throne, Prince Michael."[1] Milosh, unlike some returned sovereigns, had learned something from his experience. He repelled all attempts of foreign powers to meddle in Serbian internal affairs with the coolest insolence, and showed all his old astuteness in diplomacy. When Austria went to war with France and Sardinia in 1859, Milosh maintained a strictly correct attitude and refused to allow his subjects any opportunity of hostility toward Austria.

The last years of Milosh ended an epoch, for with him perished the old patriarchal society of which he had been a leader. His abilities were undoubtedly great, and despite his age his last three years showed the same energy and self-confidence which had always distinguished him. But they showed that he was to the end arbitrary in temperament, a law unto himself, a medieval clan chief struggling with a newer age. In dealing with his opponents, he spared no means to attain his end and murder had sometimes been the road to tyranny. Such deeds and methods, if they find any defense, must be excused on the grounds of revolution and its accompanying dangers and necessities. Milosh understanding revolution and able to combat with a Turk in diplomace, was unfit to rule a civilized state.

Milosh was succeeded without discussion by his son Michael, "in conformity with the law of 1859." Michael was thirty-seven years old. A highly gifted and intelligent man, he had travelled extensively during his sixteen years of exile, had visited Berlin, Paris, London, given close attention to Western ideas and institutions, and returned to Belgrade determined to take for his device: "The law is the supreme authority in Serbia." He realized that his country had outgrown the "patriarchal." His ambition was

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 120

to bring "progress" to his fatherland, to complete its emancipation, to obtain the withdrawal of the Turkish troops from the fortresses, to restore the ancient Serbian kingdom and to unite with it Bosnia and Herzegovina, that were still under the Turkish yoke; but acting on his motto 'Tempus et meum ins,' he devoted himself in the first place to the immediate necessities of the situation. Milosh had to the last remained a despot; Michael saw that it was necessary to restrict the autocratic power of one man. Milosh based the security of the state on himself as parish constable; Michael knew the advantages conferred by law and order. Milosh not only did not create, but actually weakened the institutions which he found; Michael gave to Serbia a civilized basis of government. The short eight years of Michael's rule were the best that his country had experienced since the achievement of her freedom.

The work of Michael lay in three main directions--the organization of a sufficient internal government, the adjustment of the relations with the Porte, and the development of a national foreign policy.[1] In all these directions he showed much originality and moderation. He attacked the internal problem first and the results were brilliant. He even went so far as to pardon his opponents and employed them in his service. In his relations with the Porte, Michael trod on delicate ground from the moment of his accession. But through his cleverness and diplomacy before June, 1867, Serbia saw the last of the Turks. The Turks and their abuses were now gone, this only because the Turks themselves were absent. Again Prince Michael was the first Serbian ruler of whom it may be said that he had a foreign policy in the true sense. His predecessors were so absorbed in internal affairs, in negotiations wit the Porte, or in obligations to the Great Powers, that they

---

[1] Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 243

were hardly able to assert their national independence and make Serbia count for something in the eyes of the world. Prince Michael was one big surprise--at different times he alarmed England, Russia, and France, cajoled Turkey and threatened Austria. Michael also seemed to have the idea of forming a sort of Balkan League for the destruction of the Turk. His diplomatic success in removing the Turkish garrisons in 1867 encouraged the other powers to support him. Roumania actually signed an alliance with him and his relations with Greece were extremely close. During 1866-1867 the Serbians were everywhere secretly working in the Balkans, particularly in Bulgaria. Michael seemed to count on a rebellion in Bulgaria, in which case he would step in and unite Serbia and Bulgaria under his rule. It is hard to know how far Michael would have gone in this venture and how much he was ready to risk. The untimely end of Prince Michael is usually given as an explanation of the failure of this plan, but it is quite probable that the moment for action had disappeared anyway. England, France, and Austria-Hungary had warned him to desist and to participate in no military activities whatsoever. Russia on the other hand advised Michael to arm and put Serbia in a complete state of military preparation. But Russia cautioned him to be patient and to wait for a favorable opportunity for the realization of his great plans. But all this advice and worry of the Great Powers was in vain because Michael, one day while walking in the Toptchider, the famous wooded heights above Belgrade, was shot dead by three assassins. The mystery of this crime has never been solved. Some say it was committed by disappointed politicians, but the most popular view put the blame on Alexander Karageorgevitch. Many think that Alexander was at this time a tool in the hands of the Austrians and this led to the assassination. It is true

that Austria reaped all the profit from the death of Michael and that some of the conspirators found refuge on Austrian soil, but there the matter rests in the absence of more decisive evidence. By this assassination, infinite harm was done to the cause of Serbia, and by the removal of this wise statesman much progress was lost.[1] In his short reign Michael had done more than any other ruler of Serbia to civilize, to educate, and to elevate the Serbian people. Serbia was seldom greater and never happier and more progressive than under his wise and beneficent rule.[2]

The Provisional Government promptly summoned the Grand Skuptchina, which elected the thirteen-year-old Milan Obrenovitch, the grand-nephew of Milosh and the last of the line, and appointed a regency of three persons, of whom the leading spirit was Ristitch, to hold office during his minority.[3] This regency immediately busied itself with internal affairs and in 1869 formed a constitution which did not turn out to be so popular and the fact that it remained unchanged for twenty years was due partly to the fact that the opposition to the constitution was divided and partly to the preoccupation with foreign affairs which the troubled conditions of the Balkans rendered impossible.

Milan attained his majority in 1872, retained Ristitch as chief adviser and won the good-will of the people by a frankly Russophile policy, and by his antagonism to the Porte.[4] The position of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish misrule was growing worse and worse. This misrule and cruelty led to an insurrection which broke out in 1875, and this insurrection could not be squelched in spite of the conferences of the Powers and Programmes of reform submitted by the Porte. Then came the atrocities committed by the Turks in Bulgaria. The Balkans were in a state of fury. At the end of

---

1. Seton-Watson, The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, p. 129
2. Temperley, History of Serbia, p. 260
3. Yugoslavia, edited by John Buchan, p. 56
4. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 134

June both Serbia and Montenegro declared war on Turkey. Serbia, through lack of strength and many mistakes, was soon on the road to defeat, and was compelled to make an appeal to the Great Powers. Europe was sympathetic. England made demands of the Porte but was ignored. Russia then decided to ignore the other powers and to act alone.

The Turks were in due time put down, and during the peace negotiations that followed, Serbian expectations ran high. By terms of the treaty of San Stefano, Serbia received first her complete independence and second the annexation of Old Serbia and Macedonia, the Vilayet of Kossovo, Vidin, and the Sanjak of Moni Bazar-Butalsas. Serbia's happiness was short; before the Peace of San Stefano could be ratified, however, it had already become quite obvious that its terms must be submitted to a wider tribunal. Great Britain strongly opposed the dismemberment of Turkey in Europe, while Austria, driven out of Italy, driven out of Germany, was more than ever bent on a policy of expansion in the Balkans with Scutari and Salonika, the Adriatic and the Aegean, as her goals.

Let us pause here to consider the general European situation as it affected Serbia. At different times, England, France, Italy, Austria, and Russia have all shown interest in this Balkan region. They have, of course, all claimed that this interest and enthusiasm was for the good and advancement of the Serbian people. We will and do notice however that each and every foreign power in dealing with Serbia puts his own interests first and those of Serbia second. Perhaps Russia and Austria give Serbia the most attention, due to the nearness of her lands. The Serbs have in most times looked to Russia more for protection than anywhere else. Perhaps Russia has her own interests at heart first as the rest, but even so she really has

given more aid and encouragement to Serbia than the other powers. At times she has proved quite disappointing but to my mind this is excusable because after all every time Russia has shown any advancement or may I say kindness toward the Balkans she has been properly stepped on by England and Austria. If in the past political history I have outlined we have seen much foreign interest and interference, beginning here with the Congress of Berlin we see a decided growth of this interest and interference. The uncomfortable feeling and discontent, balance of power, economic conditions and all that led to the outbreak of war in 1914 are all becoming more evident. The Balkans are very important in this net of intrigue, and England, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia dare not remove their eyes from that peninsula.

In 1878 Germany professed complete detachment from the conflicting interests of the Eastern question, so Prince Bismarck offered his services as "honest broker" and invited the powers to meet at conference at Berlin. Russia at this time was more interested in a large Bulgaria, so Serbia had to look to Austria for support. This support of Austria was given of course at a price: special trading facilities, access to Salonika, and the construction by Serbia of a railroad line toward Constantinople. On these terms Austria recommended the complete independence of Serbia and supported her claim for the possession of Piral, Urania, Nigh, and Leskovate. As for Bosnia and Herzegovina, both Russia and Great Britain had agreed even before the Berlin Conference opened that they should come within the Austrian "sphere of influence", and at the conference Austria further demanded that the Sanjak of Novi-Bazar be placed under the same regime.[1] While at San Stefano Russia had endeavored to achieve the emancipation of all the Christian population of the Balkans; the Treaty of Berlin, taking into consideration

---

[1] Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 140

neither fundamental justice nor the legitimate aspirations of the people concerned, thrust Macedonia back under Turkish misrule, created in Bosnia and Herzegovina a 'Balkan Alsace-Lorraine,' and far from ensuring future peace, laid a sure foundation of disappointment, jealousy, and rancor for future conflicts to arise.

Now Milan, who hitherto had been guided a great deal by Russia, completely changed the policy of his government and turned to Austria, and even went to live in Vienna for months at a time. In 1880 Austria-Hungary showed her hand of control over Milan by framing commercial agreements which placed the Serbian export trade at her mercy and procuring the dismissal of the able and patriotic Ristitch who sought to modify them. In 1881 Milan concluded with Austria-Hungary a secret agreement, whose existence was long suspected and long denied. This treaty was, as Milan's own son put it, "an act of treason" which made Serbia merely a tributary of Austria. Its influence was hardly less fatal to internal than to external freedom. The men whom Milan desired to retain in power were the so-called Liberals, whose absolutist tendencies suited his own aims, and their misgovernment was aimed at bringing back the Karageorgevitch line. The Radical party, which opposed these tendencies and stood for a strongly developed local government, was, whatever may have been the cause, implicated in a conspiracy, and many of its prominent members were executed. King Milan was now an object of general hatred and hastened into a military adventure, partly at the urge of Austria and partly to restore, if possible, his prestige. Bulgaria was in the process of annexing East Roumelia, and in Austria's mind this was an unhealthy proposition and looked almost like the fulfillment of San Stefano, Austria not realizing as yet the estranged posi-

tion between Bulgaria and Russia. The expedition was led by Milan in person, and was a complete failure, the Serbs sustaining a severe defeat at Slivnica; and Milan was saved by Austria-Hungary as in 1876 when he had been saved by Russia.

Milan's position was now beyond repair. He carried on scandalous quarrels with his wife with serious political consequence, for Queen Natalie, a Russian by birth, was naturally Russophile, and sought to counteract Milan's pro-Austrian policy.[1] After granting a "free constitution", which extended the franchise, promised freedom of the press, and made all classes eligible for election to the Skupshtina, on January 2, 1889, Milan resigned in favor of his son Alexander, then a boy of thirteen. Three regents were appointed to govern during his minority, the chief of them being Ristitch.

The rule of the regency ushered in a period of aggravated party disorders and political wrangles.[2] Alexander's education had been even more demoralizing than that of his father. On April 1, 1893, King Alexander by a coup-d'etat proclaimed himself of age and ended the regency. He at once appointed a cabinet composed of Radicals, with whom, however, he was soon in hot water. King Milan returned from Paris in February, 1894, to Serbia and Alexander by a second coup-d'etat, suspended the constitution of 1888, and replaced it by the old constitution of 1869, which allowed more opportunity for the exercise of the ruler's personal power. In June, 1900, Alexander shocked the whole of Europe by a crowning piece of folly. He married his former mistress, Draga Mashiu, the widow of a civil engineer, much older than himself and also possessing a fierce reputation; if she were to bear a son to be heir to the throne this could not have been but revolting to the Serbian nation. Even Milan was furious with this action. Under

---

1. Yugoslavia, edited by John Buchan, p. 62
2. Hrebellianovitch, The Serbian People, p. 712

Draga's influence, Alexander initiated a rule of tyranny, worthy of a Nero. The blunders and outrages of this most impossible couple did not last long. The end came on the night of June 10, 1903; a group of Serbian officers entered the palace and murdered the King and Queen, together with Draga's brothers, the Prime Minister, the Minister of War, and Alexander's aide-de-camp.[1] The next day the army proclaimed Peter Karageorgevitch King of Serbia. So the Obrenovitch dynasty ended. A week before the murder, the plot was known to more than one European court. Yet not one saw fit to intervene, or to give the couple any notice of their pending fate. As for the Serbian people, they received the news with the utmost composure and perhaps the shrug of a shoulder or a sigh of relief. The Skupshtina confirmed the election of Prince Peter to the throne five days later and Austria and Russia, who knew the circumstances best, immediately recognized his accession. The other European Powers, including Great Britain, refused to do so until the regicides were compelled to retire into private life in 1906.

Peter's acceptance marked the opening of a happier age. His fine personal qualities and unblemished record augured well for his reign, and his promise to be a "true constitutional king" was scrupulously fulfilled.[2] The Serbs knew he was loyal and knew that he upheld the interests of his country and people and that he would never desert them in an hour of danger or in defeat. The throne as a symbol never counted for much with Serbs; but the fact that King Peter had fought in the revolt of Herzegovina made him "our king" in lands beyond the Danube and the Drina. Many a Bosnian peasant made a pilgrimage to Belgrade merely to hand about the streets until he could catch a near view of the sovereign and return contented. Long

---

[1] Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 152

[2] Yugoslavia, edited by John Buchan, p. 63

before the Balkan Wars the eyes of Bosnian and Hungarian Serbs were turned with new affection to the Serbian capital.

During the first years of the new reign, there were many difficulties. Many of the foreign powers neglected to recognize Peter; also before Peter could reign peacefully there were many difficult changes to be made in the administration of internal affairs.

Before looking at the reign of Peter I let us look for a moment at Serbian interests outside of Serbia proper during the last decade of the nineteenth century. The Serbian government began to give closer attention to the furtherance of Serbian interests in Macedonia and "Old Serbia" and the protection and general welfare of the Serb inhabitants of those lands. The Serbian schools, which had been closed after the Serbo-Turkish war of 1876-78 were reopened, and for the defense of those populations against the active and aggressive Bulgarian and Greek propaganda, the united efforts of Serbia and Montenegro were able to obtain from Constantinople the nomination of a Serb Metropolitan over the Serbs of Rashka and Prisren. The visit in 1896 of Prince Nicholas of Montenegro to King Alexander at Belgrade was a manifestation of the national aim of the two Serbian rulers and their peoples. In Bosnia the Serbs instituted the cultural society called "Serbian Brothers" which gave an organized form to the general national aspirations of the Serbs in Bosnia.

Peter Karageorgevitch seemed just the man for this period in Serbian history. Well educated, a man of action in time of war or revolution, and also a man of scholarly taste and achievement, he had translated into the Serbian language John Stuart Mill's Essay on Liberty. This proved a precious gift to the Serbian people. He also pleased his nation by marry-

ing the daughter of a Prince of Montenegro. In accepting the heavy crown that was offered him, he solemnly undertook to restore all the liberties of his countrymen, to abide by the constitution of 1888 and to devote himself entirely to the restoration of peace, good will, and economic prosperity among his people.[1] These promises King Peter kept, and also he did more thatn any other monarch to help Serbia to a clear consciousness of her legitimate aspirations and to prepare his country for their realization. Serbia's trade began to grow at once, and soon her economic dependence on Austria-Hungary, who was most hostile, became practically impossible; thus Serbia in 1906 concluded a customs treaty with Bulgaria. Austria replied with a wall of tariffs--the "Pig War." The peasantry thus became very embittered against the Dual Monarchy, and this no doubt led to the future friendliness with Russia. Serbia soon, however, found outlets for her trade through Italy, Egypt, and France, by the way of Salonika which route brought her considerable prosperity. But soon a bomb was dropped, and what a bomb! One of the upsets of all Europe! One of the chief causes of the play of 1914! Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. It should not have been the shock it was; Austria had administered the provinces for the past thirty years, and it is probable that all of Europe realized that one day she would claim them as her own, but now that the expected event happened expressions of surprise and alarm came forth. Austria, in this annexation, was simply tearing up the scrap of paper known as the Treaty of Berlin.

How did Serbia feel? She was furious and in no mood to acquiesce; her protest was followed by an appeal to the Triple Entente, and particularly to Russia. The Serbian army, also at once mobilized, and every prepara-

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 155

tion was made to take the field at once if necessary. Russia, however, advised Serbia to use moderation in her action. And what did the rest of Europe do? Russia mobilized, England advised "reconsideration", and France negotiated.[1] There was real force behind the Russian objection, and Russia demanded a conference of the Powers at once. Turkey was also angry at Austria's action and demanded a money compensation. But Austria was not afraid. She had Germany behind her and also knew that the Great Powers were in no condition, or rather, position to support Serbia up to the point of war. England, whom Germany feared, could make no effective intervention in a land question, Russia was weak from her recent disaster in the Far East, hence Austria and Germany were stronger than the Triple Entente.[2]

With the result of the Balkan Wars, Austria and Germany were very shocked and very displeased. Such was the position when on June 28, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, and his concord were murdered in the streets of Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. There are many mysterious features about the tragedy. There is one thing that is certain and that is that the immediate occasion of the World War was the murder of the Austrian Archduke of Sarajevo. What are the true details of the Sarajevo plot? What were the motives of the assassins? Who were the instigators or accomplices? These are dark and difficult questions which have remained more mysterious and baffling than most of the problems relating to the immediate causes of the war. In 1914 and during the years that followed the World War, all were in sympathy with Serbia and very little blame was placed upon her for the murder. The blame that Austria-Hungary placed upon her the world claimed was violent propaganda started by the Austrian press. "The Viennese press," they said, "set itself deliberately to spread the idea

---

1. Seton-Watson, Southern Slav Questioh, p. 121
2. Steed, Hapsburg Monarchy, p. 201

propaganda

that the outrage had been organized in and by Serbia." This was a sign of Serbian desire for unity and national fulfillment. The world in general seemed ready to believe Serbia, who denied any connection with the murder and to condemn Austria.

Within the last five years, however, there have come numerous Serb revelations, whose authors appear to be moved by various motives: simply to tell the truth; to play party politics; or, an attempt, as it may seem, to claim the doubtful honor of being among those who planned the murder of the Archduke. The first of these revelations to attract attention came from the pen of a well-known professor of history at Belgrade, Stanaje Stanojevitch who says, "When the manoeuvres of the Austrian army were ordered in Bosnia and when it was announced that the Archduke was coming in person to Sarajevo, Dimitrijevitch, Chief of the Intelligence Division of the Serbian General Staff, was sure that Austria-Hungary was going to attack Serbia. He concluded the only way to avoid this was to kill the Archduke. At this time several Bosnian youths from the Belgrade University made known their wish and aim to rid of the Archduke. This was to the liking of Dimitrijevitch and thus he gave them aid, practice in the use of rivals and such. He later made known his plans and actions to the Central Committee which did not agree with him and advised him to retrace his actions. He tried to follow the advice of the Committee but word came too late and the plot was well on its way."

Ljuba Javanavitch, Minister of Education in the 1914 Serbian Cabinet, revealed how the Cabinet members had been told about the assassination plot by Premier Pashitch at least three weeks before the execution. He admitted also that nothing was done to stop the plotters and no adequate warning

passed to Austria. Barnes and other historians claim that Premier Pasbitch did not deny this charge but Trivanovitch in his article, Responsibility for the Sarajevo Assassination, claims that the testimony of Javanavitch has been denied by Pasbitch. Ljuba Javanavitch's revelations attracted at first little attention in Serbia, where well-informed persons apparently saw in them nothing really new. But when it was learned how great attention was being given to them in England and America, where people began to wake up to the extent of Serbia's responsibility for the war, some Serbian newspapers started an attack on Javanavitch as a liar and a traitor.

Another series of revelations, said to be contained in some 2,000 documents which were seized by the Austrians in Belgrade during the war, relate to the propagandist and revolutionary activities of the Serbian nationalist organizations known as the Narodua Odbrana and the "Black Hand." Many of these documents were found in the houses of Pasbitch and Milo Pavlovitch, a leading member of the Narodua Odbrana. They contain lists of "serviceable people", Bosnian editors, students and spies, and the amounts of money with which they were subsidized from Belgrade.

The Narodua Odbrana was a national defense society including political leaders of the radical party as well as military officers. This society was born in 1908 after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Universal indignation arose in hearts of the Serbians at Austria's breach of the Berlin Treaty. The organization of the society began immediately. Its Central Committee was located in Belgrade and directed the work of the District Committees. This society, the Serbians maintain was a cultural unit indulging in no revolutionary activities. It was, doubtless, not as innocent as the Serbians say, but probably the Austrians did overstress this blame

in the ultimatum, failing to distinguish sufficiently between it and the "Black Hand."

The "Black Hand" was a very secret organization consisting of Serbians, some members of the other society, who did not like the peaceful policies but would rather have more deeds. The aim of the "Black Hand" was "The realization of the National Ideal: the union of all Serbs." They preferred the terrorist method to intellectual propaganda. All the members were used through use of numbers, thus not even knowing one another aiding to stress the point of secrecy.

Of course it is ridiculous to blame the World War upon Serbia. The underlying causes of the War far outweigh the immediate causes. But evidence certainly leans toward placing the blame of the one immediate cause upon the heads of the Serbians. There are too many conflicting stories to be too sure and the evidence is not authentic enough to be over convincing, but from a study of Serbia's past history and ever-increasing desire for national unity, perhaps it is the only logical conclusion that Serbia did play a leading role in the plot that lead to the assassination.

The part Serbia played once war had been declared was small, though the Serbians were brave and suffered as much as any. The population, when easily put down by the Austrian and German troops, was treated with a disregard of every law of civilized warfare and a fiendish refinement of cruelty and malice, probably without parallel in modern history. The instructions issued to the Austrian troops, under the form of leaflets, began with the words, "You are going into a hostile country the population of which is animated by fanatical hatred and in which murder is rife in all classes of society. Toward such a population there is room for no feelings of humanity

or generosity."[1] The Austrian troops were given to understand that the campaign was an execution, and that they might not only loot and burn and ruin, but murder, violate and torture at will, "because the people were Serbians." The weakness of the Serbian resistance was due not to lack of enthusiasm and energy toward the cause, because to the Serbians this was a national question, but the weakness was more due to the fatigued and worn troops of the Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the almost total lack of ammunition, either for rifles or for artillery. The bulk of the Serbian field ordinance is of French manufacture, and the French were themselves too hard pressed to make regular deliveries of shells.

We all know the line-up, the tragedies and the disastrous results of the World War. The Serbia the outcome was most pleasant. Her one big enemy Austria-Hungary was reduced to a small state with the Hapsburgs in exile in Spain. But the question arose then, was it ever going to be possible for the Serbs to recover from the desolation that swept over them? Thousands upon thousands of the little nation of both sexes perished. Some thought it would be hard to build up once more the national life. The war-weary heroes, who had been through all kinds of fortune, living like ascetics through the long years of uncertainty, triumph and disaster, would they be able to resume the almost forgotten arts of Peace? Those who knew the Serbian peasant, the backbone of the nation, did not doubt his ability to restore the old conditons. And the spirit that led the Serbian revival of the decade before the war was not dead. 'He who has snatched his life from death,' writes M. Prodanovitch, 'is bound to spend it in labour.'[2] That proved to be the spirit of the Serbians. If ever a nation bought its union and its liberty with blood and tears, the Serbs surely have paid that

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 204
2. La Patrie Serb, No. 3, p. 102

price. For five hundred years they have never been content to submit to slavery, but have unceasingly struggled toward the light. The Serbians asked for no pity whatsoever, in fact to them it would be more of an insult. They kept faith to the utmost with the allies and accepted the loss of all as better than surrender.[1]

In 1917 the Pact of Corfu was signed by M. Pashich, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the exiled Government of Serbia, and by Dr. Trumbić, president of the Yugoslave committee. In short this Pact provided for the union of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in a single, free and independent kingdom, on a constitutional and democratic basis, under the Karageorgevitch dynasty. Local autonomy, the free exercise of religions, and the maintenance of the two alphabets were guaranteed. This Pact was the first clear and definite statement of a desire to form a combined kingdom of the three peoples which gave an indication of the basis of union. At the peace conference the South Slav statesmen of course suggested boundaries representing extreme national demands. But these demands led to too many controversies and difficulties. With Roumania, Albania, and Italy the new state of Yugoslavia at once was in conflict over boundary dispute. Thus Yugoslavia has enemies on all sides: Roumania, Albania, Italy, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Greece is her only peaceful neighbor.

Also Jugoslavia has many serious internal problems which add to unrest and difficulty. Jugoslavia bears the name of the kingdom of the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes. They form a single racial family, all using dialectic variations of the same language. Once they were united, but have, because of separation during the past years, followed separate lines of development. The Slovenes and Croats, as Roman Catholics, had looked to the

---

[1] Laffan, The Serbs, p. 282

West for their civilization, while the Serbs, as adherents of the Greek Orthodox Church, took their civilization largely from the East. Thus the Serbs were anxious for a centralized monarchy, while the Croats and Slovenes preferred a federal system giving the non-Serb elements a liberal measure of home-rule. Some Croats and Slovenes go so far as to champion the abolition of the Karageorgevitch line and are for a loosely joined republic. Also many difficulties were caused by the Bosnian Moslems, the Macedonian Slavs, and the Montenegrins. The Serbs are trying to assimilate not only the Croats and Slovenes but the Moslemized Serbs and Macedonian Slavs and also the minorities of Germans and Magyars along the Northern and North-western frontier. These are the present problems--as to the future, time alone can tell.

I have tried to give a brief outline of the History of Serbia and the influence outside powers have had upon it. Nationalism, rare, has been born within this people, downtrodden and played with by foreign nations. Up to 1914 the nationalistic feeling of the people steadily grew stronger and stronger. It was, as we have seen, at one moment given a push, a send-off, the next moment retarded and held back. But always the Serbian people have looked forward to and worshipped a national liberty. During the World War, it sensed a deep shock, crushed and almost stamped out of existence, and since the World War's end it has been revived, at first with much enthusiasm, but now it seems changed. It lacks, this new kind of nationalism, a feeling of unity. It also seems to lack security. The people making up this Jugoslav nation do not somehow seem as "one". Perhaps in time all difficulties will be wiped out, but time alone can judge.

Not only the history of Serbia and its foreign relations were the basis for this nationalistic feeling so fine, but also Serbian literature, and now

let us turn and have a glance at this phase.

And what part does literature play in the nationalistic game? We may note that any country which has held to its national traditions has witnessed a literary background. What has this background consisted of in Serbia?

We will recall that in the 9th century almost all the Jugoslavs abandoned their old paganism and adopted Christianity. As the new religion came from Rome and Greece, two empire living in permanent disputes, the first Jugoslav literature appeared in this religious character and consisted of a constant struggle between native and exotic elements. It is very difficult for any individual foreign to this country to be attracted by these early rudiments of literature which have been more historical and linguistic than of any literary value and which comprise from about the tenth to the end of the fourteenth century. This literature was written in the old slavonic language, flourished in the great United Serbian State, and vanished with the conquest of that State by the Turks.

The second period of Serbian literature may justly be called the period of renaissance. This period would cover practically from the end of the fourteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century. This literature was no longer written in the old Slavonic dialects but in the pure Serbo-Croatian vernacular. It bears no relation to the literature of the ancient period, but relies rather on classic models, and grew up under the shadow of the earlier civilization of Italy.

The third period of Serbian literature is really a period of decline. It started after the earthquake in Dalmatia in 1667 and lasted to the close of the eighteenth century. This literature was mostly cultivated in Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slovenia. Roman Catholic influence prevailed everywhere, and

only a few authors of any importance are to be found.

The Jugoslav literature of the latest period, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, includes the folklore and is more developed, and by its virtue of extraordinary richness and variety of form, it occupies a larger space in a literary history of the Jugoslavs than the literature of any preceding period. It is quite modern and possesses a peculiar fascination. Let us look more carefully at the work of this last period of the 18 and 19 hundreds.

It is only within the last few years that the importance of folklore, the popular legends, tales, drolls, and extravagances which have been handed down from gneration to generation among the laborers, peasants, and youth of a nation, has been frankly recognized.[1] It is now, however, generally recognized that this kind of literature, which more than all others deserves the name of popular, possesses a value beyond any momentary amusement which the tales themselves may afford, and it has assumed an honorable position side by side with other and graver materials, and has obtained a recognized use in deciding the conclusions of the historian and ethnologist. In Serbia there is a curious distinction in the use of prose and rhythm in these folk stories. Prose is the vehicle for tales related by women, rhythm the prerogative of men. Prose stories are usually told in the domestic circle and in **gatherings** of women at the Selo or Prelo. During the summer evenings, when labor and household occupations have come to a close, it was, and indeed still is, customary in Serbian villages for young girls, accompanied by some older female friends, to gather in groups under the branches of some wide-spreading tree and then while the younger people occupy themselves in spinning, some of the older women interest the rest of the company by relating these traditional stories. Men are excluded from these gatherings, and

---

[1] Mijatovies, Serbian Folk Lore, p. 1

the storytelling which fills up the chief part of these evenings is looked on as exclusively a feminine occupation. These stories are most always in prose. There are, indeed, men storytellers. Their tales of stories, however, invariably assume the character of poems and they are generally accompanied by the monotonous sounds of the gusle. Generally speaking these poems relate historical or mythical events in the life of the nation.

These are the stories, poems, and ballads, all so nationalistic, that have urged the Serbian nation on. That the Serbian people, as a distinct Slav and Christian nationality, did not succumb altogether to the Ottoman oppressor, that through nearly five centuries of subject to the Turk and the Southern Slavs retained a deep consciousness of their national ideals, is due in a very large measure to the Serbian national poetry, which kept alive in the hearts of the Jugoslavs deep hatred of the Turk, and gave birth, among the oppressed Slavs, to the sentiment of a common misfortune.[1] The national ballads made possible that collective effort which culminated in the defeat of the Turk on the battlefields of Ka[illegible]anovo, Monastir, Scutari, and many others.

Who wrote these poems? We might as well ask who is the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey? If Homer be the collective pseudonym of an entire cycle of Hellenic national bards, then "The Serbian People" is that of the national bards who chanted those Serbian epic poems during the centuries, and to whom it mattered little that their names should be attached to them. The same theory applies to Serbian national songs. They are not songs made by cultured or highly educated poets--songs which, becoming popular, are sung by the common people. They are songs made by common people themselves.[2] The task of collecting Serbian national poetry and folklore was performed

---

1. Petrovitch, Serbia, p. 274
2. Petrovitch, Legends of the Serbians, p. 6

with much ability by a self-taught peasant, the famous Vuk Stephanovitch Karadgitch, and he made this collection at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Vuk Karadgitch was born in 1787, and was illiterate until his eighteenth year, when, on the outbreak of the insurrection, he passed into Sirmia and attended an elementary school. At the age of twenty he became a student of the first Belgrade High School; in 1813 intercourse with the philologist Jernei Kapitar inspired him with the ambition to give a literary form to the popular Serbian language. From 1814 until his death in 1864 he devoted himself to a work of reform, which was one long and bitter struggle against ignorance and prejudice, and was only in the last years of his life crowned with success. He composed grammars and dictionaries of the Serbian language, and wrote many critical essays and commentaries which established a solid basis for the reform of the language. Even more important was his spelling reform, which on a strict phonetic basis of thirty letters for the thirty sounds which exist in the language, made Serbian the most logically and easily written idiom in Europe, unequaled even by Italian in this respect. Vuk's literary work includes critical and historical writing, but will be remembered chiefly for his important collections of songs, stories, sayings, proverbs, and popular charades, and of national poetry. The popularization of these collections has given a common literary language to the mass of the Serbian people. Vuk's first collection of Serbian national poems, which he wrote down as he heard them from the lips of the Serbian national bards, was published for the first time in Vienna in 1814, and was not only eagerly read throughout the whole of Serbia and in the literary circles of Austria and Germany, but also in other parts of Europe.

The Poems mostly dwell on the glory of the Serbian medieval empire,

lost on the fatal field of Kassava. Professional bards went from one village to another, chanting in an easy and decasyllabic verse the exploits of Serbian heroes and Haiduks. The bards carried news of political and other interesting events, often correct, sometimes more or less distorted, and the gifted Serbians did not find it difficult to remember and to repeat to others the stories thus brought to them in poetic form. As the rhythm of the poems is easy, and as the national ballads have become interwoven with the spirit of every true Serbian, it is not rare that a peasant who has heard a poem but once can repeat it. In Serbian Hungary there are schools in which the blind learn these national ballads, and go from one fair to another to recite them before the peasants who come from all Serbian lands. But this is not the true method. In the mountains of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, there is no occasion to learn them mechanically; they are familiar to all from infancy. There is hardly a tavern or inn around any Serbian village where one could see an assembly of peasants without a guslar around whom all are gathered, listening with delight to his ballads.

We can now easily see the influence that literature as a whole has had in holding tight the great nationalistic feeling. The history of the Serbian and other Slavonic nations developed in a poetic form, and has thus been converted into a national property, and is preserved in the memory of an entire people so vividly that a Western traveller must be surprised when he hears even the most ignorant Serbian peasant relate to him something at least of the old kings and Tsars of the glorious dynasty of Nemanovitch, and of the feats and deeds of national heroes of all epochs.

There is one more phase of Serbian life which has had its bearing on the development of nationalism, and that is party or society life. What we

can relate of this is very limited, because up to the time following the World War only secret societies and parties existed. Most of these societies as far as we can make out were formed within schools, and their purpose seemed to be to spread nationalistic propaganda. There were many right in Serbia, some in Bosnia, and several in foreign parts, Italy and France, formed by forced Serbian emigrants. Besides spreading propaganda these societies also encouraged practice in the right use of a pistol, and any physical training that would aid one in time of war. Most of the organizations were small in number. They said, "We don't want large organizations; we work in small places, five or six in a place, no more. Large organizations are always betrayed. They are not practical. You have to have lists of members, a secretary, dues and all that, many hindrances to action of any kind." The members of these societies seemed to be very young; one would almost call them members of a youth movement. These societies were very carefully observed by Austrian spies, who were placed not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also in Serbia proper. How much work these societies actually accomplished is hard to tell, due to unreliable sources. Also we fear there is much exaggeration for the purpose of creating propaganda. There is one thing of interest in relationship to this society life: that is that Gauro Princep, the young boy who fired that fatal shot on the 28th of June in 1914 which killed Archduke Ferdinand and thus set the world afire with hatred and war passion, was a member of one of these societies. The party life today in Serbia is very different. It is no longer secret, but in the open and very much like the party life of other countries. There are two main parties today in Serbia: the Radicals and the Democrats, and the queer thing concerning them is that the Radicals are conservative and the Democrats are radical. The Radi-

cals are fundamentally Serbian and the Democrats are Yugoslav. Radicals appeal mainly to peasant voters and Democrats to business men. Both of these parties are directed by professional statesmen, who really do not have many differences among themselves. There is no basic difference between the parties; the country is beset by factions, nursing historic grievances, by sectional machines, and by personal cliques; they are all seeking government jobs and trying to put through special legislation; the greatest service that anyone could render this country would be to abolish these blocs and substitute two great parties, one progressive and the other conservative, one in power and the other acting as a check on its capacity.[1]

Now we have come to an end of the forces of nationalistic growth in Serbia. They have been many in number, including the History of the Serbian people, foreign influence, Serbian literature, and society life. And all together, what has been the result, success or failure? This fight for nationalism in Serbia has been life itself to these downtrodden folk. I believe, taking all in all, we can call it a success. It surely was a success at the close of the World War when they gained all they had prayed for, all their dreams came true. But already we wonder, will this evident success remain a success or turn out in the end to be a dismal failure? Many nationalistic problems seem to have arisen in this new Yugoslavia since 1918. No longer does this fight for nationalism maintain the unity it once possessed. Now that these Slav peoples have gained their one outstanding dream, they all want to have come true their small individual dreams. The Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes appear to be losing the cooperative spirit which did so much in helping them gain their desire. There are, it is true, many historic differences which cause fear in the hearts of some when they think of Serbian assimilation.

---

1. Beard and Raden, Balkan Pivot: Yugoslavia, p. 114

There is a difference of opinion as to where the physical and economic future of the Yugoslav nation lies. Some say only a turn to Western civilization and progress will save this newly-formed nation, while some maintain that there is something in the Yugoslav race and its rural economy which makes it immune to science, business enterprise, and machinery, the transforming features of Western civilization. But as a final word, all I can say is: only the future can render a verdict in this case.

Armstrong, H., The New Balkans, Harper and Bros., New York and London, 1926.
A Look at each Balkan State and Its Conditions Following the World War.

Asken, A., The Stricken Land. Dodd, Mead and Co., New York, 1916.
Picture of Servia up to time of World War and description of the Serbian lands immediately after the first Austrian victory.

Beard, C. and Radin G., Balkan Pivat, Yugo slavia. MacMillan Co., New York, 1929.
The most important phases of Yugo slavia today--the country's natural resources, political organization, economic situation and foreign relations.

Burhan, J., Yugo slavia. Hodder and Stoughton. London, 1924.
The new problems facing the new state. This book stresses the political organization.

Chiral, S. V., Serbia and the Serbs. Oxford University Press., 1914.
In this book is shown very plainly the foreign problems Serbia had to face previous to 1913.

Davis, N. S., Short History of the Near East. MacMillan. New York, 1922.
Very good history of Turkey and the Balkans.

Gambier, J., Serbia. Kegan Paul and Co., 1878.
Description of Serbia, customs tradition, and history up to the Treaty of San Stefeno.

Gibbons, H., Nationalism and Internationalism. Stakes Co., New York, 1930
A comparison of the two giving the virtues and vices of each.

Gooch, G., Nationality. Yale University Press, 1929.
An essay on this debatable subject in an effort to prove how justifiable it is.

Graham. S., S X Vitus Day. Appleton and Co., 1931.
An historical novel on the importance of the day June 28th. Also it follows the thread of the life of Garvis Princep.

Hayes, C., Essays on Nationalism. MacMillan. New York, 1931
Collection of essays, some praising nationality, others disproving it.

Hayes, C., Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism. MacMillan, New York, 1931.
Sketch of the growth and changes in national ideas. A picture of the differences in nationalism before and since the World War.

Laffan, R., Guardians of the Gare. Clarendan Press. 1918.
This book shows the importance of the location of Serbia as to the opening to the Balkans and Constantinople through which Germany and Austria had to steer.

Lazarovitch and Hrebelianovitch., The Serbian People. Scribner, New York, 1910.
The Serbian people from Kassonova on, their customs, traditions, literature and foreign relations.

Miller, M., The Balkans. Putnam. New York, 1896.
This book deals with all the Balkan states and their relations to one another and to the Turks.

Mijatatvic, E. Serbian Folk-lore. Isbister Co. London, 1874.

A book of Serbian folk-tales. It contains the most popular stories and is the most popular collection among the Serbs themselves.

Petrovitch, N., Legends of the Serbians. Stokes. New York, 1915.
Collection of Serbian stories, mostly written in youthful style, showing lack of Serbian education.

Petrovitch, N., Serbia. Stokes. New York, 1915
History of Serbian people, traditions, literature. This book appears to be more or less a means of Serbian propaganda.

Ranke, F., History of Serbia. Murray Co. London, 1847.
Deals with the insurrections of 1804 and 1815 with great length, giving reasons for the insurrections themselves and the results.

Schevill, F. History of Balkan Peninsular. Harcourt, Brare and Co. New York, 1922
History of the Balkans from the Byzantine Epoch through the Great War.
This book is an excellent detail history.

Seton-Watson, R., Rise of Nationality in the Balkans. Dutton. New York, 1918.
This book takes each of the Balkan states separately and shows us how different were the reasons that spurred each on in the growth of nationality.

Stanoyevitch, Dr. B., Early Jugoslav Literature. Columbia University Press, 1922
A description of the different phases of the literature. Each separate group is described in detail.

Stanoyevitch, Dr. B., Yugoslav Pietry. Gorham Press. Boston, 1925
A collectioh of Serbian poetry. This is a typical collection and is surprisingly large in number devoted to nationalisms

Stead, A., Serbia by the Serbians. Heinemann. London, 1909
Habits, manners, customs, traditions of the Serbian People from the Serbian point of view.

Temperly, H., History of Serbia. Bell and Sons. London, 1917
An excellent, comprehensive study of Serbia from its beginning to the time immediately following the World War.

Tamle, G., Principal Cities of the Danube. Osgood Co. Boston, 1877
Short histories of Romania, Bulgaria and Serbia.
Quite incomplete and does not deal with all the problems.

Trevelyan, G., The Serbians and Austria. Wyman and Sons. London, 1915
The differences and grudges between Austria and Serbia.
A little pro-Serbian.

Velimirovic, N., Serbia in Lightness and Darkness. Langmans, Green andCo., London, 1916
Portrait of Serbia at the height of her independence and freedom and then the different situation immediately following June 28, 1914.

Waring, L., Serbia. Halt and Co., 1918
A small but very good book, written in an interesting style on the life in Serbia.

Wiles, J., Serbian Songs and Poems. Allen and Unevin Co. London, 1917
A Collection of national songs and poems.

Zimmern, A., Nationality and Government. McBride and Co. New York, 1919

The relation between the government and nationality and the affect one has upon the other.

Date Due

Demco 293-5

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02551 6768

Thesis
Darmedy, E.F.
1933
Darmedy, Eleanor F.
Nationalism in
Serbia since the Fren
revolution.

Thesis
Daremdy, E.F.
1933

Daremdy, Eleanor Frances
Nationalism in Serbia since
the French revolution.